

J 57/4

GUIDE FOR SETTING JTPA TITLE II-A
AND TITLE III (EDWAH)
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR PY 89

May 1989

Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development
Employment and Training Administration
U. S. Department of Labor

READER
FICHE

best copy available

L 37.8:

GUIDE FOR SETTING JTPA TITLE II-A
AND TITLE III (EDWAA)
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR PY 89

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
PREFACE	v
 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
I. Elements of a Performance Standards System	I-1
II. Purpose and Background	I-4
III. Objectives	I-4
IV. Opting to Use the Nationally Developed Adjustment Methodology	I-5
V. Description of the Technical Assistance Guide	I-7
 <u>PART A -- Implementing A Performance Standards Management System</u>	
I. Introduction	A-1
II. State Decisions.....	A-1
III. Planning Process	A-4
IV. Review of Plan and Establishment of SDA Performance Standards	A-14
V. Monitoring	A-16
VI. End-of-Year Performance Review	A-17
VII. Importance of Reporting	A-19
 <u>PART B -- National Standards</u>	
I. Introduction	B-1
II. The PY 88-9 National Standard Values	B-2
III. Relationship Between the National Standards and the Model Departure Points	B-5

PART C -- Governor's Adjustment Methodology

- I. Background C-1
- II. Secretary's Parameters C-2
- III. Impact of Governor's Adjustment Methodology
on Appeals C-4

PART D -- National Adjustment Methodology:
Development of PY 88-89 Models

- I. Introduction D-1
- II. Background D-2
- III. How the Model Works D-3
- IV. Choice of Data Sets..... D-5
- V. How the Models Were Selected D-7
- VI. Final Factors Included in Worksheets D-9
- VII. Factors Considered But Not Included D-13

PART E -- National Departure Points Used in PY 89
Worksheets

- I. Introduction E-1
- II. Departure Point Options Considered for PY 89
Worksheets E-2
- III. Identifying Exemplary or Sanctionable
Performance in PY 89 E-3
- IV. Effects of the New YEC Definition E-5

PART F -- Steps for Varying the Performance Standards
When Using the Model

- I. Basic Calculation Steps For All Measures F-1
- II. Steps to Calculate the Performance Standards for
the Welfare Entered Employment Rate and the
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate F-5

III. Options for Governor to Consider After Initial Calculation Steps	F-9
---	-----

PART G -- Further Adjustments by the Governor

I. Introduction	G-1
II. Governor's Adjustment Within Tolerance Ranges..	G-3
III. Extreme Factor Values	G-6
IV. Target Groups or Terminee Characteristics Not Included in Model	G-13
V. Local Economic Conditions	G-40
VI. Adjustments for Program Design Problems	G-45
VII. Adjusting Cost Standards to be Consistent with Other Adjustments	G-51
VIII. Productivity Improvement Adjustment	G-53
IX. Importance of Negotiation in Adjustment Process	G-54

Part H -- Setting Performance Goals for Service-Provider Contracts

I. Varying Performance Measures at the Service Provider Level	H-4
II. Setting the Level of Performance Goals for Service Providers	H-11
III. Converting Performance Measures to Contract Terms	H-13
IV. Checking that the Service Provider Goals Add Up to the SDA Goals	H-22
V. Summary.....	H-26

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Attachments:

- (1) General Instructions for Completing the JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets for Titles II-A and III for PY 89

Appendix A (cont.)

- (2) Supplemental Instructions for Calculating Selected Items on the JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets
- (3) JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets For PY 89, Titles II-A and III
- (4) SDAs Excluded from Model Development Because of Extreme Circumstances
- (5) Alternative Ranges of Performance

Appendix B

Attachments:

- (1) State/SDA Economic Data
- (2) State Welfare Recipient Entered Employment Rate Ratio and Welfare Recipient Follow-up Employment Rate Ratio

Appendix C

Attachments:

- (1) Computation Formulas for Titles II-A and III Performance Measures
- (2) JTPA Annual Status Report and Instructions
- (3) Worker Adjustment Annual Program Report and Instructions

PREFACE

This document replaces the previous Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) for setting Title II-A performance standards for Program Year (PY) 88 dated June, 1988. It provides current information and detailed guidance on the Department's optional adjustment methodology for setting Title II-A and Title III standards for PY 89 (July 1, 1989 - June 30, 1990) and is intended to simplify the Governors' tasks in setting and implementing local performance standards as required by Section 106 of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). For the convenience of TAG users, new information and revised procedures for PY 89 are highlighted in the margins by an arrow (—>).

For certain jurisdictions, however, the Department's adjustment methodology may not be appropriate for setting their Service Delivery Areas' (SDAs') performance standards because the methodology does not reliably account for these jurisdictions' unique economic circumstances and program characteristics. These jurisdictions are: Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. Whatever methodology is used in setting standards for SDAs in these jurisdictions, the adjustments must be made within the parameters established by the Secretary as described in Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 9-87 dated May 5, 1988.

Requests for additional copies of this publication or any questions concerning information in this guide should be addressed to Martha Muirhead, U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Room N-5310, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210 or telephone 202-535-0687.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

I. ELEMENTS OF A PERFORMANCE STANDARDS SYSTEM

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) is designed to be a performance-driven program. Performance standards are the tools used to insure that the program is a productive investment in human capital. Predetermined performance standards to assure achievement of the program's objectives are, therefore, a central feature of JTPA.

PERFORMANCE
STANDARDS
A CENTRAL
FEATURE OF
JTPA

Section 106 of JTPA assigns the responsibility for the establishment of National Standards to the Secretary of Labor. The application of performance standards, however, rests with the Governors.

Performance standards provide the Governor with a means for determining those service delivery areas (SDAs) that are eligible for rewards or that need technical assistance, and, ultimately, those SDAs that should be sanctioned.

Until PY 86, performance standards were based on average CETA performance. They were used by Governors to identify above or below average performance. Those SDAs with actual performance above the standards were considered eligible for rewards. Those with performance below the standards received technical assistance. CETA data far underestimated JTPA performance, however, and was viewed as a minimally acceptable, rather than average, level of performance.

In PY 86, performance standards were explicitly defined to reflect a minimal level of expected performance, thereby identifying SDAs needing technical assistance or requiring sanctions. Using this definition, SDAs with actual performance below the standard are considered poor performers and those with performance above the standard can be either satisfactory or good performers depending on the extent to which they exceed the standard. The Department has suggested that Governors reexamine their incentive, technical assistance and sanction policies. With the "below average" definition of standards, should SDAs performing above the standard, but well below average receive incentives? Although new performance measures were introduced in PY 88, the concept of performance standards as a minimal level of expected performance was retained.

The elements of a performance standards system are as follows:

PERFORMANCE
STANDARD
DEFINED

- ° Definition of "Standard". The standards are generally defined to be a minimally acceptable level of performance, with the exception of adult average wage at placement, which was set at a higher level than the other standards to emphasize the importance of placing participants in better than entry-level jobs.
- ° Measures. There are twelve performance measures for Title II-A for PY 88-9: For Adults -- Entered Employment Rate, Cost per Entered Employment, Average Wage at Placement, and Welfare Entered Employment

Rate; For Youth -- Entered Employment Rate, Employability Enhancement Rate, Positive Termination Rate, and Cost per Positive Termination; For Adults at Post-program -- Follow-up Employment Rate, Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate, Weeks Worked in the Follow-up Period and Weekly Earnings of all Employed at Follow-up.

There are two performance measures for Title III for PY 89: Entered Employment Rate and Average Wage at Placement.

<---

- ° Setting the Standard. For eight of the Title II-A measures, Governors are required to set a local SDA standard according to procedures established by the Secretary. At least one of the standards set for each SDA must be a "quality of placement" standard either the average wage at placement or weekly earnings at follow-up, or both. In addition, at least one of the standards for each SDA must be a non-cost youth standard -- positive termination rate, employability enhancement rate, or youth entered employment rate. Governors are also required to set in PY 89 an entered employment rate standard and are encouraged to set an average wage at placement goal for Title III substate area (SSA) programs as well as their statewide, regional and industrywide programs. In determining substate standards, Governors should consider local factors that are likely to influence performance.

- ° Application of the Standard. Once the standard is determined, the Governor is responsible for applying the standard after the period of performance by determining whether the standard has been met or exceeded, and by providing rewards, technical assistance or sanctions, as appropriate.

II. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The State is responsible for:

- ° implementing an overall reliable, quantifiable, objective performance standards system (i.e., specifying how the standards will be set, when, how and by whom performance results will be reviewed, how incentives/technical assistance funds will be distributed, and when and how sanctions will be applied, etc.);
- ° maintaining a management information system including information necessary to implement performance standards; and
- ° if determined appropriate, choosing an objective adjustment methodology following the Secretary's Parameters to account for differences in local conditions.

III. OBJECTIVES

This Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) provides guidance to the Governor on how the Department of

Labor's adjustment methodology may be used to vary national performance levels to account for differences in local conditions among SDAs/SSAs.

This document demonstrates:

- ° the importance of performance standards throughout the JTPA program management cycle -- in planning, monitoring, assessment and evaluation;
- ° the need for a timely, accurate reporting system at the State and Federal level to establish and adjust national performance standards; and
- ° the relevance of a fully-documented adjustment approach to setting SDA standards that account for unique local conditions.

IV. OPTING TO USE THE NATIONALLY DEVELOPED ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY

The Governors are permitted to vary the performance standards established by the Secretary in accordance with the parameters cited in Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 9-87 dated May 5, 1988. Although Governors are much more aware of their jurisdictions' local circumstances than the Department, they still face the problem of varying the performance standards fairly, objectively and consistently across SDAs. If this is not done, the Governors may receive numerous complaints that they varied the standards arbitrarily, which, in the case of a sanction, may result in appeals to the Secretary.

Experience has shown that "poor performance" is a relative term. What may be poor performance for one area, based on its local conditions, may be good performance for another. Thus, the Secretary has established an adjustment methodology to assist Governors in evaluating whether a particular SDA is performing above or below a reasonable performance level given a selected set of local factors. The choice of whom to serve remains at the discretion of the SDA, with performance expectations adjusted accordingly.

**"POOR PER-
FORMANCE"
IS A RELA-
TIVE TERM**

The Title II-A adjustment methodology accounts for 24 local factors (depending upon the performance measure) in the same way for all SDAs. The Title III adjustment methodology accounts for 11 local factors. Hence, all SDA (SSA for Title III) jurisdictions -- large or small -- are treated alike for the purpose of adjusting their performance standards.

←
**ADJUSTMENT
METHODOLOGY
TREATS ALL
SDAs/SSAs
ALIKE**

Use of the DOL methodology reduces the required documentation that Governors would have to provide if local performance standards were subjectively adjusted. It fulfills the parameter requirements for each of the 24 local factors; hence, States need only document further adjustments made beyond the model. In cases of appeals where an SDA is sanctioned, the Secretary will be predisposed to agree with those Governors who used the Department's methodology appropriately.

**MODEL
FULFILLS
PARAMETER
REQUIRE-
MENTS**

The Department's methodology does not include all factors that may influence performance; therefore, an SDA/SSA may have additional circumstances that will warrant further adjustments to the model-derived performance levels. Governors may want to

**ADDITIONAL
ADJUSTMENTS
CAN BE MADE**

regard the model-derived performance levels as the starting points from which consideration should be given to those additional circumstances that may affect an SDA/SSA's performance.

Governors need to determine the nature of these additional circumstances and their probable effects, either positive or negative, on performance expectations. Because most types of additional circumstances rarely occur statewide, an SDA/SSA's model-derived performance levels should be adjusted individually and with supporting documentation. The amount of adjustment allowed by the Governor as a result of these additional circumstances should be based on a documented procedure that adheres to the Secretary's parameters.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GUIDE

This TAG consists of eight parts and three appendices:

PART A describes a full-cycle management system in which performance standards are the cornerstone. This section encourages the use of the model and describes an approach for using this methodology in several operational areas.

PART B gives the numerical national standards for PY 88-9 that Governors can elect to use as unadjusted standards. This section also tells how they relate to the national departure points used in the adjustment methodology.

PART C outlines the descriptive parameters established by the Secretary that Governors must adhere to when adjusting their performance standards. This part explains ways of meeting these parameters and the significance of the methodology in cases of an SDA appeal.

PART D traces the development of the modeling approach including the utility of the regression method of accounting for local factors. Local factors and model selection are discussed, as well as a description of the data bases used in the analysis.

PART E discusses what options were considered for use in the current methodology and how the PY 88-9 national departure points were derived.

PART F explains the five basic calculation steps that should be followed when adjusting each of the performance standards.

PART G describes the various options available to Governors in considering further adjustments to the model-derived performance levels. Specific adjustments are suggested for factors not included in the model.

PART H suggests how to set performance goals for use in service-provider contracts and how to vary performance targets for different service providers.

Appendix A contains the general instructions for completing the JTPA Performance Standards

Worksheets, supplemental instructions on how to calculate SDA factor values, and sample worksheets. Other attachments include a listing of SDAs for which the models may work poorly because of extreme SDA circumstances and alternative ranges of performance the Governor may use in designing incentive and sanction policies.

Appendix B provides the user with SDA data -- earnings in retail and wholesale trade, growth rate in earnings, employment in manufacturing, mining and agriculture, unemployment rate, population density, poverty income and employee/resident worker ratio -- needed to determine economic planning values, as well as the State welfare recipient entered employment rate ratio and State welfare recipient follow-up employment rate ratio.

Appendix C includes the formulas for calculating each of the performance measures and copies of the Titles II and III reporting forms and instructions.

PART A

IMPLEMENTING A PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

PART A
IMPLEMENTING A PERFORMANCE STANDARDS MANAGEMENT
SYSTEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Performance standards, an integral part of the JTPA legislation, are basic to planning, implementing, managing, assessing and evaluating the program. As such, they should play a pivotal role in good program management throughout the program year. This section describes how performance standards can be used as key management tools in each of those functions.

PERFORMANCE
STANDARDS
PIVOTAL
ROLE IN
GOOD
PROGRAM
MANAGEMENT

II. STATE DECISIONS

The Governor has a number of decisions to make concerning performance standards. Specifically, the Governor must determine:

GOVERNOR
HAS A
NUMBER OF
DECISIONS
TO MAKE

° Title II-A Standards

- which eight of the twelve national standards will be set for SDAs;
- which quality of placement standard will be set for SDAs — the average wage at placement or weekly earnings at follow-up;
- which youth standard(s) will be set for SDAs;
- whether additional standards, including those for serving hard-to-serve individuals, will be established and used for the purpose of awarding incentive grants;

° Title III Standards

- whether to set the optional average wage at placement goal; and
- whether additional standards will be established for Title III programs.

° Data Requirements

- what planning data elements will be required from the SDA/SSAs and in what format;
- what actual data must be reported, in what format and how often (e.g., monthly, quarterly, semi-annually or annually); and
- what definitions will be used for additional data elements. (Definitions of those items required for federal reporting must conform to the definitions provided in the Glossary of the JASR.)

° Adjustment Procedures

- what adjustment methodology will be used to vary the standards;
- whether SDA/SSA standards will be established unilaterally or through a negotiation process;
- what factors will be considered in making adjustments to the standards, and what documentation the SDA/SSAs will have to submit concerning these factors; and
- whether standards will be revised based upon job training plan modifications received during the program year and/or based upon actual performance during the program year.

° Youth Standards

- whether positive termination and employability enhancement standards will be adjusted for SDAs which will have difficulty in meeting the stricter requirement for the reporting of youth employment competency attainments and for SDAs which emphasize employment-directed programs; and
- how PIC-certified youth competency deficiencies and attainments will be tracked and credited.

° Postprogram Standards

- what system will be used in the State to collect follow-up data from program terminatees: a centralized system operated by the State or a contractor, or a decentralized system operated by SDA/SSAs; and
- whether adjustments for differences in response rates between the employed at termination and not employed at termination groups are established.

REQUIREMENT

NOT A

CHOICE

° Title II Performance Assessment Procedures

- how "exceeding" performance standards and satisfactory performance are defined when standards reflect a minimal level of performance;
- whether 6% participants and costs will be included in the calculation of performance standards and actual performance;
- what is the basis for apportioning the incentive/technical assistance funds;

- whether all of the standards set for each SDA will be assessed equally or whether some will be given more "weight" in making rewards/sanctions decisions;
- how failure to meet the Secretary's standards is defined;
- what are the sanctioning policies and procedures for failure to meet standards for two consecutive years;
- how and how frequently performance standards will be monitored during the year; and
- how technical assistance will be provided for SDAs who fail to meet standards.

———>

- ° Title III Performance Assessment Procedures
 - whether monetary incentives will be used for rewarding substate grantees, particularly those providing long-term training; and
 - how long term training programs will be defined for purposes of incentives.

III. PLANNING PROCESS

As State staff are preparing their statements of goals and objectives, they need to determine what planning information they will require their SDA/SSAs to include in their job training plans (e.g., narrative description, numerical planning figures, documentation requirements, etc.).

States planning to use the DOL adjustment methodology will need the planned performance data for

the eight chosen performance measures to determine the expected outcomes. Items required for each of the twelve Title II-A national measures are as follows:

1. Adult entered employment rate
 - The number of adults who are expected to terminate;
 - The number of adults who are expected to enter employment.
2. Cost per entered employment
 - Total planned expenditures for adults;
 - The number of adults who are expected to enter employment.
3. Average wage at placement
 - The anticipated average hourly wage for adults who are expected to enter employment.
4. Welfare entered employment rate
 - The number of adult welfare recipients who are expected to terminate;
 - The number of adult welfare recipients who are expected to enter employment.
5. Youth entered employment rate
 - The number of youth who are expected to terminate;
 - The number of youth who are expected to enter employment.
6. Youth positive termination rate
 - The number of youth who are expected to terminate;

- The number of youth who are expected to have a positive termination (either enter employment or meet one of the employability enhancement terminations).
7. Youth employability enhancement rate
 - The number of youth who are expected to terminate;
 - The number of youth who are expected to meet one of the employability enhancements, whether or not they are expected to enter employment.
 8. Youth cost per positive termination
 - Total planned expenditures for youth;
 - The number of youth who are expected to have a positive termination.
 9. Adult follow-up employment rate
 - The number of adults who are expected to respond to a follow-up contact;
 - The number of adults who are expected to be employed at time of follow-up.
 10. Welfare follow-up employment rate
 - The number of adult welfare recipients who are expected to respond to a follow-up contact;
 - The number of adult welfare recipients who are expected to be employed at time of follow-up.
 11. Weekly earnings of all employed at follow-up
 - The anticipated average weekly earnings for the 13 weeks after termination by

employed adult terminees who respond to follow-up contact.

12. Weeks worked in the follow-up period

- The anticipated number of weeks worked in the 13 weeks after termination by adult terminees who respond to a follow-up contact.

Items required for each of the two Title III national measures are as follows:

<—

1. Adult entered employment rate

- The number of dislocated workers who are expected to terminate;
- The number of those expected to terminate who are called back or retained by original employer after the receipt of a layoff notice; and
- The number of dislocated workers who are expected to enter employment.

2. Average Wage at Placement

- The anticipated average hourly wage for dislocated workers who are expected to enter employment.

This minimum list of planned performance data will provide the information needed to calculate the expected outcomes for the following measures:

° ADULT

- Entered Employment Rate -- The number of adults who entered employment as a percentage of the number of adults who terminated;

ADULT
MEASURES

- Cost per Entered Employment -- Total expenditures for adults divided by the number of adults who entered employment;
- Average Wage at Placement -- Average hourly wage for all adults who entered employment at the time of termination; and
- Welfare Entered Employment Rate -- The number of adult welfare recipients who entered employment as a percentage of the number of adult welfare recipients who terminated.

° YOUTH

YOUTH MEASURES

- Entered Employment Rate -- The number of youth who entered employment as a percentage of the number of youth who terminated;
- Positive Termination Rate -- The number of youth who had a positive termination (either entered employment or met one of the employability enhancement definitions) as a percentage of the total number of youth who terminated;
- Employability Enhancement Rate -- The number of youth who attained one of the employability enhancements (whether or not they also obtained a job) as a percentage of the total number of youth who terminated.

- Cost per Positive Termination -- Total expenditures for youth divided by the number of youth who had a positive termination (as explained above).

° POSTPROGRAM

- Follow-up Employment Rate -- Number of adult respondents who were employed during the 13th week after program termination as a percentage of the total number of respondents (terminees who completed follow-up interviews).

**POSTPROGRAM
MEASURES**

- Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate -- Number of adult welfare respondents who were employed during the 13th week after program termination as a percentage of the total number of adult welfare respondents.
- Weekly Earnings at Follow-up -- Total gross weekly earnings of respondents who were employed at the 13th week divided by the total number of respondents employed at the 13th week.
- Weeks worked in the Follow-up Period -- Total number of weeks worked in the 13 week follow-up period for all respondents divided by the total number of respondents.

° DISLOCATED WORKER

←

- Entered Employment Rate -- Number of individuals who entered employment at

termination (excluding those who were recalled or retained by original employer after receipt of a layoff notice) as a percentage of total terminations (excluding those who were recalled or retained by original employer after receipt of a layoff notice.)

- Average Wage at Placement -- Average hourly wage for all persons who entered employment at the time of termination.

To establish SDA or SSA-specific performance standards, Governors adopting the DOL adjustment methodology will need to obtain planning data on at least the following local factors from their SDA/SSAs:

- ° Terminee Characteristics (Adult) -- number and/or percent of:
 - Female
 - Age 30 or More
 - Black
 - Hispanic
 - Offender
 - Dropout
 - Post High School Attendee
 - Unemployed 15 Weeks or More
 - Not in Labor Force
 - UC Claimant
 - AFDC Recipient
 - GA/RCA Recipient

- ° Terminee Characteristics (Welfare) -- number and/or percent of:
 - Female
 - Black

←

- Dropout
 - Unemployed 15 Weeks or More
 - Not in Labor Force
 - GA/RCA Recipient
- ° Terminee Characteristics (Youth) -- number and/or percent of:
- Female
 - 14-15 years old
 - 16-17 years old
 - Black
 - Hispanic
 - Asian/Pacific Islander
 - Dropout
 - Student
 - Post High School Attendee
 - Handicapped
 - AFDC Recipient
 - GA/RCA Recipient
 - Not in Labor Force
- ° Terminee Characteristics (Dislocated Workers) -- number and/or percent of: ←
- Female
 - Age 55 or Older
 - All Minority (including total Blacks, Hispanics, Asians/Pacific Islanders, and American Indian/Native Americans)
 - Dropout
 - Post High School Attendee
 - Handicapped
 - U.C Claimant
 - Unemployed 15 Weeks or More
 - Previous Wage (Average hourly wage of all participants prior to enrollment)

- ° Percent of Participants in PY 89 who were
Terminees in PY 89 (Adult and Youth)
- ° Local Economic Conditions for the SDA/SSA
(Provided in Appendix B, Attachment 1)
 - Unemployment Rate
 - > - % Families with Income Below Poverty
Level
 - % Employment in Manufacturing, Mining,
and Agriculture
 - Population Density
 - Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale
Trade
 - > - Growth Rate in Annual Earnings in Retail
and Wholesale Trade
 - Employee/Resident Worker Ratio

The Act already requires SDAs to submit some of this information to the Governor in their job training plans. For instance, Section 104(b) (2) requires that the job training plans contain a description of the services to be provided, including the estimated training cost per participant. In addition, Section 104(b) (10) requires that the job training plan contain procedures for the preparation and submission of an annual report to the Governor that shall include:

- ° a description of activities conducted during the program year;
- ° characteristics of the participants; and
- ° the extent to which the activities exceeded or failed to meet relevant performance standards.

**VARIATIONS
MAY BE
CALCULATED
BY THE
STATE**

In order to be consistent with the parameters issued by the Department, States should advise SDA/SSAs of their planned adjustment approach, (i.e., what adjustments will be made for youth positive termination and employability enhancement standards, local conditions, services to groups not included in the methodology, atypical service levels; etc.) and how SDA/SSAs should document any requests for additional adjustments to the standards.

The States that elect to use the Department's methodology have two options concerning who calculates the local model-adjusted performance levels. In the first option, States choose to require the SDA/SSAs to report their planned service levels, current economic conditions and proposed outcomes as part of the planning process. This information will enable the States to (1) adjust their performance standards based on SDA/SSA local planning factors and (2) further vary the model-adjusted performance levels, if necessary, to take into consideration additional circumstances. The Governor may also consider the appropriateness of adjusting some of the measures for productivity improvements.

**VARIATIONS
MAY BE
CALCULATED
BY SDAs**

Alternatively, States provide SDA/SSAs with the worksheets during the planning process and require them to calculate the model-adjusted performance level for each measure. The completed worksheets could be included in the SDA/SSA Job Training Plan submitted to the Governor. States may also require that SDA/SSAs planning service to target

groups not included in the model or intensive pilot programs indicate these intentions in their Job Training Plan. This initial documentation could assist Governors in later determining whether further adjustments to model-adjusted performance levels are warranted.

Requiring SDA/SSAs to calculate their own model-adjusted performance levels may be more advantageous because it allows the SDA/SSAs to see how different service strategies and participant mix affect expected performance. Such information will be useful to SDA/SSAs in negotiating final standards regardless of which approach is taken. Finally, the better an SDA/SSA understands how certain factors influence expected performance, the greater the likelihood that the SDA/SSA will use this methodology to monitor its performance. Such information will allow SDA/SSA officials to determine whether to request a modification, policy decision, staff guidance and/or training.

**CALCULATIONS
MADE BY SDAs
AND SSAs MAY
BE MORE
ADVANTAGEOUS**

IV. REVIEW OF PLAN AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SDA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

After the model-adjusted levels have been determined, State staff should compare the SDA/SSA's model-adjusted levels to its planned outcomes. This comparison should enable the staff to answer the following questions:

- ° Are model-adjusted levels consistent with planned outcomes? An SDA should plan to exceed its model-derived performance level to avoid being caught short at the end of the year.

**STATE
REVIEW OF
PLANNED
OUTCOMES
AND THE
MODEL-
ADJUSTED
LEVELS**

- ° If planned outcomes are inconsistent with the model-adjusted levels, what is the reason for these differences (e.g., additional adjustments, calculation error, etc.)?
- ° If an SDA/SSA has requested an additional adjustment, has adequate documentation for it been submitted with the Job Training Plan?
- ° If the State requires adjustments to some measures, do the planned outcomes reflect such adjustments?

When reviewing SDA/SSA plans, States should decide what type of adjustments will be considered and what documentation is required even though adjusting planning standards is not necessary or even feasible. SDA/SSAs could then include planned service levels to special target groups not in the model, youth program strategies, and anticipated pilot programs in their job training plans and collect the necessary data on these factors during the year.

**NEGOTI-
ATIONS
SHOULD BE
PUBLIC**

Whether the State uses a formal request and approval process or chooses to negotiate standards with SDA/SSAs, ground rules should be established that ensure a public, objective, fair and consistent decision-making process. Such rules should be conveyed to all SDA/SSAs far enough in advance that SDA/SSAs with varying resources and expertise have equal access to adjustments.

Standards calculated on planned levels of service are targets or estimated standards. States using the model must compute final performance standards at the end of the program year based on actual local factor values. Standards may be reestimated throughout the course of the year to respond to changes in participant mix, different service strategies, or changes in local economic conditions.

INITIAL
STANDARDS
CHANGE
DURING
PROGRAM
YEAR

V. MONITORING

As States exercise their oversight responsibilities, they should compare SDA/SSA actual performance with "current" standards rather than with standards calculated at the beginning of the planning cycle. Periodic monitoring enables States to recalculate standards for those SDA/SSAs whose actual conditions are substantially different from those anticipated at the beginning of the planning cycle. Without periodic performance evaluation, an SDA/SSA could be exceeding its target all year relative to initial estimated standards, but because of an improvement in local conditions or changes in participant mix, the SDA/SSA ends up performing very poorly relative to its actual standards computed at the end of the year.

STANDARDS
PLAY A KEY
ROLE IN
MONITORING

The Governor may use monitoring information to identify SDA/SSA performance "successes and failures". Those that are exceeding their standards may be reviewed by the State to determine what they are doing differently than the less successful SDA/SSAs. Exemplary programs, procedures and systems could be shared with other SDA/SSAs as

"models" for local review and consideration. The Governor could also use staff from "model" SDA/SSAs to assist in developing monitoring instruments, assistance guides and procedures manuals, or in conducting statewide or substate-specific training. Technical assistance that features successful programs identified through monitoring has two advantages: It stretches limited resources and is better received among SDA/SSAs because it is developed and conducted by their peers.

**SDA/SSAs
SHOULD
MONITOR
THEMSELVES**

SDA/SSAs may conduct their own on-going monitoring. They need to know whether they are meeting their performance standards; and if not, what factors are contributing to the unanticipated performance. Early performance results, however, can be misleading. For example, entered employment rates may be high at the beginning of the year and taper off later on when difficult-to-place participants are eventually terminated. Not until the SDA/SSAs submit their end-of-year reports to the States will they know, with relative certainty, whether they will be eligible for an incentive award or will be in need of technical assistance.

VI. END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW

**END-OF-YEAR
REVIEW**

At the end of each program year, Governors should review each SDA/SSA's actual performance against their final performance standards and determine which ones have exceeded or failed to meet them.

**RECALCULATE
STANDARDS
USING
ACTUAL DATA**

States adopting the DOL adjustment methodology must plan to recalculate performance standards

at the end of the year based on actual conditions, i.e., actual terminee characteristics, percent participants who terminated, and updated economic conditions. More recent unemployment rates, area wage data and population density than that contained in this guide should be obtained from appropriate sources. The recalculated standards then become the first step in determining whether SDAs have achieved their performance standards.

The worksheets provided in this guide are inappropriate in recalculating final PY 88 performance standards. Use of different weights and factors than those used in SDA plans may produce unanticipated and unfair performance expectations at year-end.

NEW WORK-
SHEETS NOT
RECOMMENDED
FOR FINAL
PY 88
STANDARDS

The recalculated result becomes the SDA/SSA's final performance standard unless the Governor chooses to further vary the model-adjusted levels as suggested in Part G or to make further adjustments based on unforeseen circumstances that have occurred in an SDA/SSA's jurisdiction. Any Governor's adjustments made on the basis of planned values should be reexamined at the end of the year after reviewing the recalculated results. The problem that initially motivated an adjustment may be eliminated later in the year. Further, the appropriate size of the adjustment may be very different when final standards are recalculated. In those States where final performance standards are negotiated, such standards should be determined only after additional adjustments have been reevaluated to ensure that all changes that affected performance are taken into account.

YEAR-END
REVIEW
OF ADJUST-
MENTS

**DETERMINING
WHETHER OR
NOT THE
STANDARDS
WERE
EXCEEDED**

The Governor should then compare actual performance for each SDA/SSA against the final performance standards in order to determine whether the standards were exceeded. The results of this end-of-year performance review should be used to determine which SDA/SSAs are eligible for incentive grants, and which ones require technical assistance, or perhaps ultimately require the imposition of sanctions for failure to meet their standards for two years.

NOTE: Follow-up performance measures should incorporate the adjustment for response rate differences when required. The adjusted performance measures should be the same as the outcomes reported on the JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR).

VII. IMPORTANCE OF REPORTING

—> The Department requires annual SDA reports on terminatee characteristics, outcome information and postprogram data on Title II-A programs for adults, adult welfare recipients and youths. Annual substate and statewide reporting on similar information for Title III programs is also required beginning in PY 89 on the Worker Adjustment Annual Program Report (WAPR). Depending on whether the Management Information System (MIS) is statewide, either SDAs, substate grantees or the States may compile and submit this data.

**REVIEW
DEFINITIONS**

During planning Governors should review definitions of reported data elements to ensure consistency within the State.

Governors often require their SDAs/SSAs to submit more information than is federally required (such as characteristics of special populations, program specific information on adults/youths) and on a more frequent basis. Such information should be used to assist the Governors in carrying out their statewide monitoring activities. SDAs/SSAs may require even more information from their service providers (i.e., data showing service to groups not in the model) to document the need for additional adjustments.

State and SDA/SSA data entry and reporting must be complete, accurate, consistent and timely. This required information has many uses. The Governors will use it for periodic monitoring purposes and for determining which SDA/SSAs exceeded or failed to meet their standards. The SDA/SSAs will use reports to monitor their progress throughout the year, to identify service providers that need technical assistance, to determine whether a modification is needed, and to make sound management decisions concerning a myriad of programmatic and operational situations.

The Department will use the information to determine end-of-program year performance levels, to update the standards adjustment methodology for the next program year, and to develop the National Standards. In addition, these data are used for evaluation and strategic planning and to respond to Congressional and public inquiries.

Late, inaccurate or inconsistent reporting hinders the usefulness of the requested information at all levels. Governors should carefully review SDA/SSA reports for missing or questionable items and/or

STATE MIS
REPORTS
SERVE MANY
USES

POOR
REPORTING
HURTS ALL
LEVELS

inconsistencies before transmitting such reports to the Department. In particular, failure to include on the JASR the terminnee characteristics and program outcomes of participants served using 6% funds will undermine the ability of future models to adjust standards for service to the hard-to-serve. State staff should review not only information reported on participant outcomes and terminnee characteristics, but on post-program contacts, including response rates and the employment and earnings status of those interviewed 13 weeks after termination.

Reporting deadlines within a State should conform to the Federal schedule to ensure that States have sufficient time to review and transmit JASR/WAPR reports within 45 days after the program year ends. Failure to submit these reports promptly or to provide the Department with updated data as they become available will impede the updating of the model and the development of the national standards.

SUBMIT
REVISED
REPORTS

PART B

NATIONAL STANDARDS

PART B
NATIONAL STANDARDS

I. INTRODUCTION

Section 106 of JTPA directs the Secretary to establish performance standards for adult, youth and dislocated worker programs. The Secretary may modify these performance standards no more than every two years. The standards have continued to evolve as experience in JTPA has grown. For PY 84/85, national standards were established using data from CETA. PY 86 provided the first opportunity to set national standards reflecting JTPA program goals and experience. In PY 88, the Department for the first time added to the original seven measures and established national standards based on JTPA post-program data. The numerical national standards represent performance goals for the nation as a whole and now represent starting points for determining SDA/SSA performance standards by Governors who use the DOL adjustment model.

Eleven of the national standards for PY 88-9 represent a level of minimal performance nationwide given anticipated program and administrative refinements and continued improvement. The PY 88-9 national standards anticipate the following programmatic developments:

- ° continued increased emphasis on serving the most disadvantaged, particularly the less literate, at-risk, and those in welfare households;

TEN
NATIONAL
STANDARDS
SET MINIMUM
PERFORMANCE
GOALS

- ° richer, more extensive services to youth;
- ° continued emphasis on quality job placements; and
- ° increased unit costs for all programs that will encourage targeting greater resources where appropriate to enhance current skill training of those most in need.

II. THE PY 88-9 NATIONAL STANDARD VALUES

PY 88-9 national numerical values have been revised for five of the seven existing measures to reflect the above mentioned program goals. In addition, national standard values have been established for five new measures. The PY 88-9 national standards are compared below with the PY 86-7 standards.

Comparison of PY 86-7 and PY 88-9 National Standards

NATIONAL STANDARDS		
	PY86-7	PY88-9
<u>Adults</u>		
Entered Employment Rate	62%	68% *
Average Wage at Placement	\$4.91	\$4.95
Cost per Entered Employment	\$4374	\$4500*
Welfare Entered Employment Rate	51%	56% *

Youth

Entered Employment Rate	43%	45% *
Positive Termination Rate	75%	75% *
Employability Enhancement Rate	--	30% *
Cost per Positive Termination	\$4900	\$4900*

Postprogram

Follow-up employment Rate	--	60% *
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate	--	50%
Weeks Worked in the Follow-up Period	--	8 *
Weekly Earnings of all Employed at Follow-up	--	\$177*

Title III

Entered Employment Rate	--	64% *	<—
-------------------------	----	-------	----

* Standards set at the lowest quartile of expected performance or lower.

Nine of the national performance standards have been set at the lowest quartile of expected performance based upon PY 86 experience. The cost standards are even more lenient.

These standards are the departure points in the PY 88-9 models. For those set at the lowest quartile

of expected performance, the national standards represent that point at which at least 75% of the SDAs can be expected to exceed their standard if conditions remain similar to those in PY 86.

The cost per positive termination standard has not changed since PY 84-5. This level represents significantly higher unit costs for youth programs than was actually experienced in PY 86. This more lenient CPT standard reflects a JTPA commitment to encourage flexibility in providing a full complement of services to youth including youth employment competencies.

The youth positive termination rate has been set at a level that reflects a minimum level of performance now that youth employment competency systems are fully implemented.

The youth employability enhancement rate standard is an estimate of the 25th percentile of previous performance in SDAs having fully developed youth competency systems where youth have attained competencies in two or more areas.

The average wage at placement standard has been raised from \$4.91 to \$4.95, above the 25th percentile, to highlight the importance of placing adult participants in better paying jobs. The adult cost per entered employment standard has been set at the 10th percentile, to encourage provision of more comprehensive programs where appropriate and necessary.

The rate of employment at follow-up for welfare recipients is set at slightly above the 25th percentile to emphasize the Department's commitment to achieving more stable employment for welfare recipients, thereby reducing their dependence on welfare.

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NATIONAL STANDARDS AND THE MODEL DEPARTURE POINTS

In PY 88-9, all twelve numerical national standards for adult and youth programs and the standard for the Title III entered employment rate are also the departure points in the models. There is no national standard for the average wage at placement goal in Title III, thus, the departure point in the model is set at the Governor's discretion.

Generally the numerical national standards represent a minimum level--the lowest quartile--of expected performance. Therefore, most SDAs should exceed the national standard. The national standard for average wage is the major exception. It more closely resembles an estimate of average performance. For this measure SDAs may have to strive harder to meet the national standard. Its counterpart in the postprogram standards, the follow-up weekly earnings measure, has been set at a lower level and will be easier to attain.

PART C

GOVERNOR'S ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY

PART C
GOVERNOR'S ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY

I. BACKGROUND

Section 106(e) permits the Governors to prescribe variations in the Title II-A and III performance standards, within the parameters established by the Secretary as specified in Training and Employment Guidance Letter 9-87, dated May 5, 1988. Variations may be based on specific economic and geographic factors in the State, the characteristics of the population to be served, and the types of services to be provided. These parameters do not prescribe numerical limitations on the extent to which Governors may vary the standards for several reasons:

- ° Because prior performance levels have varied greatly for some measures, the Department determined that it would not be feasible to establish meaningful and reasonable numerical limits around the national standards;
- ° Numerical parameters would restrict the Governor's adjustment authority; and
- ° Because Governors assess performance against the standards for the purpose of distributing incentive grants, imposing sanctions and providing technical assistance, the Department determined that they should be allowed considerable authority to determine the appropriate levels at which the standards should be established.

GOVERNORS
HAVE
DISCRETION
IN
ADJUSTING
LOCAL
STANDARDS

II. SECRETARY'S PARAMETERS

In light of the preceding explanation, the Department decided to issue descriptive parameters for PY 84 that will remain in effect through PY 89. States are required to have a systematic adjustment approach that meets the following criteria:

SECRETARY'S PARAMETERS

Procedures for adjusting performance standards must be:

- ° Responsive to the intent of the Act;
- ° Consistently applied among SDAs;
- ° Objective and equitable throughout the State; and
- ° In conformance with widely accepted statistical criteria.

Source data must be:

- ° Of public use quality and
- ° Available upon request.

Results must be:

- ° Documented clearly and
- ° Reproducible.

Adjustment factors must be limited to:

- ° Economic factors;
- ° Labor market conditions;
- ° Characteristics of the population to be served;
- ° Geographic factors; and
- ° Types of services to be provided.

Some of the above criteria may warrant further explanation.

**EXPLANATION
OF SELECTED
PARAMETERS**

- ° The phrase, "procedures must be consistently applied," indicates that similar remedies should be made available to any SDA in the same situation and the same standard-setting approaches, i.e., national standards, DOL model or alternative approach, should be used for all SDAs within a State.
- ° The phrase, "procedures must be objective and equitable," implies that adjustments should be quantifiable, that the data used should be made known to every SDA, and that the adjustments have a demonstrated relationship to the performance of local programs. The factor weights recommended in Section G fulfill these requirements.
- ° The phrase, "source data must be of public use quality," is intended to convey that the data used must be able to withstand public scrutiny. The data should be developed by a Federal, State, local governmental agency or other reputable source, and compiled according to acceptable data collection and analytical procedures. It may include data contained in a State JTPA Management Information System (MIS).
- A university might use economic data collected from governmental sources, adjust it to coincide with the SDA's geographical configuration (following a prescribed set of procedures), and

provide it to the States, along with appropriate documentation, for use in varying the standards. This example would meet the public use quality criteria.

III. IMPACT OF GOVERNOR'S ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY ON APPEALS

APPEALS

FROM SDAs-- ETA POLICY CONCERNING USE OF MODEL

Use of either the PY 88 or 89 worksheets for any measure will satisfy the parameter criteria in setting PY 89 performance standards. As indicated in Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 9-87, dated May 5, 1988, ETA will be predisposed to uphold a Governor's determination in the case of an appeal from an SDA that is sanctioned, if the Department's methodology was used to vary the standards. If the Governor elects to use an alternative approach, or to change any of the pre-printed values on the Department's performance standards worksheets, the Secretary will make decisions concerning appeals on a case-by-case basis, based on whether the adjustment approach meets the Secretary's parameters.

PART D

NATIONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY: DEVELOPMENT
OF PY 88-89 MODELS

PART D

NATIONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODOLOGY:

DEVELOPMENT OF PY 88-89 MODELS

I. INTRODUCTION

The DOL methodology for adjusting PY 89 SDA performance standards is similar to the one used to vary Title II-A performance standards for PY 88. The PY 89 methodology was issued in Training and Employment Information Notice (TEIN) No. 19-88, dated February 3, 1989. Based upon the recommendations of the JTPA Performance Standards Technical Workgroup, models have been developed using JTPA data for all measures. Different factors are included in each model reflecting those terminnee characteristics and economic conditions that influence program performance for that particular measure. This section includes a discussion of the regression modeling technique used in setting and adjusting standards and a detailed explanation of the current PY 89 methodology.

To be responsive to Title III, the Department developed modeling worksheets (which parallel Title II-A worksheets) for the Title III entered employment rate standard and the optional average wage at placement goal. The new worksheets reflect the change to substate area reporting required under Title III. Other differences between the Title II-A and Title III entered employment rate and average wage at placement worksheets are:

←

- <—
- ° Title III models aggregate all minority groups into one category so that each receives a similar adjustment.
 - ° The Title III wage at placement model includes pre-program wages as an adjustment factor. Although this information is not currently reported on the JASR, it is typically collected at intake, and is included in the proposed EDWAA reporting requirements. Pre-program wage is defined as the hourly wage from the job of dislocation.
 - ° Because there is no national standard for the average wage at placement, there is no departure point on the AWP worksheet. Governors may set a placement wage level that reflects their own programmatic goals and local conditions.

II. BACKGROUND

The concept of performance standards for basic employment and training programs began with the 1978 amendments to CETA that encouraged prime sponsors to plan and operate programs according to quantitative measures of accomplishment and cost. As early as 1977, the Department began formulating a quantitative approach to define the relationships between program performance and certain "interpretive factors" such as participant characteristics and local economic conditions. In FY 82, initial performance standards for prime sponsors, were issued using multiple regression analysis. This approach provides quantifiable, objective and

equitable adjustments to performance standards to account for local conditions.

Under JTPA, the standard-setting approach and the adjustment methods to vary SDA performance levels have built upon those used in the development of CETA performance standards. This methodology has evolved and will continue to evolve over the next few years as new and improved data sources and modeling alternatives become available. Any adjustment approach that is developed will be subject to the same public and academic scrutiny as previous modeling efforts and may be periodically revised as needed.

The methodology selected for use in establishing Title II-A and Title III performance is multiple regression analysis. It is based on program or terminnee data for the most recently completed program year, and is provided in the form of a simple worksheet from which to calculate each SDA/SSA's performance standards.

III. HOW THE MODEL WORKS

The potential for successful outcomes from a program depends, in part, on the environment in which the program operates. In order to make valid, equitable comparisons among SDA/SSAs, one needs to hold constant those factors over which the service deliverer has little or no control. The problem in setting SDA/SSA standards is how to account for variations in these environmental factors that are known to influence a program's performance, e.g.,

PROBLEMS IN SETTING STANDARDS

characteristics of the people served and local labor market conditions (local factors).

The DOL model uses a statistical technique that empirically and objectively determines the variation in performance that is attributable to the differences in local factors. The advantage to using the model is that it takes many local factors into account simultaneously and explains a substantial portion of the variance in performance among SDA/SSAs. Thus, accounting for those local factors does not penalize the SDA/SSA for local economic conditions or for a decision to serve more disadvantaged participant groups.

**MULTIPLE
REGRESSION
ANALYSIS**

The "weights" included in the model's equation show the direction (positive or negative) and magnitude of each local factor's influence on performance when all the factors in the model are taken into consideration. These weights are based on past average relationships between factors and performance outcomes.

To determine how important a local factor is in influencing the performance of a specific SDA, the "weight" for the factor is multiplied by the extent to which the SDA/SSA differs from the national average for that local factor (e.g., the difference between the SDA/SSA's average unemployment rate and the national average unemployment rate). The result is the anticipated local impact of that factor. The sum of the anticipated local impacts of all factors is the total effect of local factors on an SDA/SSA's performance. This total effect is either added to or subtracted from the national departure point to obtain the model-adjusted performance standard for the SDA/SSA.

IV. CHOICE OF DATA SETS

The first step in the model-building process involved selecting the most appropriate data base from which to obtain trainee characteristics.

Two data sources were examined for use in the development of PY 89 adjustment models -- the JTPA Annual Status Reports (JASRs) and the Job Training Quarterly Survey (JTQS), formerly known as the Job Training Longitudinal Survey (JTLS). JTQS is a survey of trainees from 142 SDAs.

The JASR data did better at predicting adult, youth, and post-program outcomes, i.e., it accounted for more variation among SDAs. Furthermore, adjustment weights for local economic conditions can be estimated more precisely if the models are developed from the JASR data. Thus, the Department has based all adult, postprogram, and youth models (except of the YEEN) on the most recent JASR data (PY 87).

The youth employability enhancement model was developed using data on Title II-A youth trainees from the PY 87 Job Training Quarterly Survey (JTQS) which annually provides information on the outcomes and characteristics of about 3,000 Title II-A youths.

—> The models for Title III were developed using data from the JTQS because JASR data for Title III were reported only on a Statewide basis and were not sufficient for modeling. The Title III models were estimated using PY 85 JTQS data because these data could be merged with local economic conditions which have a substantial influence on Title

III outcomes. Subsequent JTQS data did not allow the estimation of models including local economic conditions.

For the PY 88 and PY 89 cost models, a new program factor replaced the factor that in previous years adjusted for average program length. The program factor, % termines, represents the portion of participants who terminate during the program year. Experience has shown that programs that carry over more participants into the next program year are more likely to incur higher program costs than those that terminate all or nearly all their participants. The relationship between costs and average length of stay in the program has become less meaningful due to more cost-efficient service provision (e.g., increased use of cost-sharing arrangements) and continued inconsistency in the local definition and reporting of average weeks of participation.

The following is a detailed listing of the reasons why some SDAs were excluded from the data used to develop models:

SDAs EX-
CLUDED FROM
ADULT
SAMPLE

- ° Past performance traditionally has been "atypical" due to local economic conditions and population characteristics, i.e., the U.S. Territories (Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands);
- ° The SDA had extreme service levels or extreme outcomes;

- ° The SDA had an extremely small number of terminees (35 terminations or less);
- ° The SDA had a follow-up sample size of less than 35;
- ° The SDA had a follow-up response rate of less than 40%;
- ° The SDA did not report follow-up data; or
- ° The SDA improperly excluded one of the groups, either employed or unemployed at follow-up from the computation of average weeks worked.

A total of 591 SDAs were included in the adult models, 587 SDAs in the youth models, and 559 SDAs in the welfare model. For the follow-up models, 563 SDAs were included in the adult employment rate model, 555 in the weekly earnings model, 536 in the average weeks worked model, and 506 in the welfare employment rate model.

V. HOW THE MODELS WERE SELECTED

SELECTION OF FACTORS IS CRUCIAL

The most crucial decision in developing a quantitative model is the selection of the local factors to be included. The factors should be relevant to the activity or operations expected in a typical JTPA program and should make sense intuitively. However, not all of the factors that influence performance can be, or should be, accounted for in the model.

To be included in the model, each candidate factor had to meet five criteria:

- ° The factor had to have a strong relationship to outcomes;
- ° It had to be consistent with DOL policy, i.e., that SDAs should be held harmless for it;
- ° It had to be objective and easily quantifiable;
- ° Data for it had to be available at the sub-State level; and
- ° It could not reflect management practices.

**CRITERIA
FOR FACTOR
SELECTION**

Once the local factors were identified, regression analysis was used to determine the direction and magnitude of each local factor's influence on performance expectations for each measure. The models resulting from the inclusion of various sets of factors were evaluated using the five criteria. The local factors in the models were kept as consistent as possible given the various performance measures. A technical workgroup comprised of representatives from the JTPA community reviewed proposed models and selected the most appropriate ones.

**VARIOUS
MODELS
TESTED**

A technical report, providing more detailed information on the current regression modeling approach, entitled Development of Adjustment Models for PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards prepared by SRI International, will be available in May upon request from Martha Muirhead, U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Room N-5310, 200 Constitution Avenue, N. W., Washington, D.C. 20210 or (202) 535-0687. This report will describe the estimation techniques, statistical testing of models, and variable selection procedures.

VI. FINAL FACTORS INCLUDED IN WORKSHEETS

The tables on the following pages indicate those local factors included in the PY 89 adult, youth, and postprogram worksheets.

Because of the two year lag for using JASR data in developing models, the PY 89 models can only include characteristics available on the PY 87 version of the JASR.

Local Factors Included in the PY 89 Adult Worksheets

<u>Entered Employment Rate</u>	<u>Cost per Entered Employment</u>	<u>Average Wage at Placement</u>	<u>Welfare Entered Employment Rate</u>
TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS:			
% Female		% Female	% Female
% Age 30 and Above		% Age 30 and Above	
% Black		% Black	% Black
	% Hispanic		
% Dropout	% Post High School Attendee	% Dropout	% Dropout
% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More
% Not In Labor Force	% Not In Labor Force		% Not In Labor Force
% AFDC Recipient	% AFDC Recipient		
% GA/RCA Recipient	% GA/RCA Recipient		% GA/RCA Recipient
	% UC Claimant	% UC Claimant	
	% Terminees		
LOCAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS:			
Unemployment Rate		Unemployment Rate	Unemployment Rate
	Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)	Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)	
		Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	
* Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	Annual Earnings in Retail and Whole- sale Trade (000)	* Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)
* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		% Families Below Poverty Level	* Employment in Manu- facturing, Mining and Agriculture
		* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade	* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade
* New factors in PY 89 models			

Local Factors Included in the PY 89 Youth Worksheets

<u>Entered Employment Rate</u>	<u>Positive Termination Rate</u>	<u>Employability Enhancement Rate</u>	<u>Cost per Positive Termination</u>
TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS:			
		% Female	
% 14-15 years old		% 14-15 years old	% 14-15 years old
		% 16-17 years old	
% Black	% Black		
	% Hispanic		% Hispanic
	% Asian/Pacific Islander		
% Dropout		% Dropout	
% Student	% Student	% Student	% Student
	% Post-High school Attendee		
% Handicapped		% Handicapped	% Handicapped
		% Not in Labor Force	% Not in Labor Force
		% AFDC Recipient	% AFDC Recipient
% GA/RCA Reci- pient	% GA/RCA Recipient		
			% Terminees

LOCAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS:

Unemployment Rate		
* % Families Below Poverty Level	Population density (1000s/sq.mi.)	
* 3 yr. Growth Rate Annual Earnings in Retail and Whole- sale Trade	Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)

* New factor in PY 89 youth models

Local Factors Included in the PY 89 Postprogram Worksheets

<u>Adult Follow-up Employment Rate</u>	<u>Adult Follow-up Weekly Earnings</u>	<u>Adult Follow-up Weeks Worked</u>	<u>Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate</u>
TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS:			
	% Female		
% Age 30 and Above	% Age 30 and Above		% Female
% Black	% Black	% Black	% Black
% Dropout	% Dropout	% Dropout	% Dropout
	% UC Claimant		
% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	% Unemployed 15 Weeks or More
% Not In Labor Force		% Not in Labor Force	% Not In Labor Force
% AFDC Recipient		% AFDC Recipient	
% GA/RCA Recipient		% GA/RCA Recipient	% GA/RCA Recipient
LOCAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS:			
Unemployment Rate		Unemployment Rate	Unemployment Rate
	Population Density (1000s/sq.mi.)		
	Employee/Resident Worker Ratio		
* Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	* Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	* Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)
	% Families Below Poverty Level	* Employment in Manu- facturing, Mining and Agriculture	* Employment in Manu- facturing, Mining and Agriculture
* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade	* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Whole- sale Trade	* 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Whole- sale Trade	

* New factors included in postprogram worksheets

VII. FACTORS CONSIDERED BUT NOT INCLUDED

**REASONS FOR
NOT
INCLUDING
SPECIFIC
FACTORS**

As indicated, numerous factors were examined for inclusion in the model. The following represents a partial listing of those factors that were excluded from the PY 89 models and the rationale for not including them.

- ° Students were excluded from the adult termination and postprogram models because there were too few in the adult sample to make any meaningful analysis. UC claimants were excluded from the youth models for the same reason.
- ° All educational levels are represented in the youth models. The models contrast all groups against high school graduates (no post high school)--the group that is always omitted. However, post-high school attendees have entered-employment and employability enhancement rates similar to high school graduates. When groups such as this one do not appear, they are included with high school graduates. In the entered employment rate model, for instance, the effect of dropouts and students are contrasted to the effect of being high school graduates and post-high school attendees. In the cost per positive termination model, dropout, was excluded because it is counterintuitive and in the positive termination rate model, dropout was excluded because the sign was positive and very small.

- ° Certain minority groups have been excluded from adult and youth models because modeling shows effects inconsistent with program experience, (that is, that service to such groups would raise predicted placement rates or lower costs). One reason given for reduced costs is the ability of SDAs to draw upon other resources targeted to these groups.
- ° Models containing regional variables were examined. Including these variables minimized individual SDA differences within regions. Because the purpose of modeling is to capture differences between SDAs, region was, therefore, excluded.
- ° The feasibility of including a variety of economic factors was examined. Factors considered were alternate measures of urbanization and industrial mix. These measures were excluded because they were not statistically significant or were highly correlated with other included economic factors.

Because factors--either terminnee characteristics or local economic conditions--are excluded from the model does not necessarily mean they fail to influence local performance. Some factors are excluded because when all SDAs serve similar populations or face equivalent economic conditions, they would receive essentially the same adjustment. In fact, when an SDA is faced with extreme

circumstances relative to other SDAs (see Part G), the Governor should consider such a factor as a basis for a further adjustment to the model-derived performance level.

To summarize, this modeling technique attempts to account for numerous factors that influence SDA performance, yet are outside the control of the service deliverer. Hence, the model identifies as "poor performance" outcomes that are below and costs that are above the model-predicted performance levels. This modeling approach is constrained by the availability of terminnee and economic data at the SDA level; thus, not all variables that influence performance are included.

PART E

NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINTS USED IN PY 89 WORKSHEETS

PART E
NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINTS USED IN PY 89
WORKSHEETS

I. INTRODUCTION

The departure point on the worksheet establishes the level from which modeling adjustments are made, upward or downward, in determining an SDA's expected performance. If the national departure point is set too low, the resultant standards become meaningless as nearly all SDAs will exceed their expected performance. If the departure point is placed too high, many SDAs will be pushed to the uppermost limits of performance at the risk of being sanctioned, which may reduce local flexibility in serving those most in need.

SDA performance standards are used to distinguish good performing SDAs that deserve rewards and poor performing SDAs that need technical assistance and, possibly, sanctioning. Before PY 86, performance standards had been used to identify good (or poor) performing SDAs based upon above (or below) average performance. The redefinition of performance standards to represent minimal acceptable performance, and the corresponding change in departure points, suggests that standards will be more useful in identifying SDAs that need technical assistance. Because the standards are now less useful in identifying exemplary performance, States should continue to examine incentive policies in light of this definition. Governors will need to distinguish between satisfactory and exemplary performance to make rewards.

DEFINITION
OF
"STANDARDS"
CHANGED

II. DEPARTURE POINT OPTIONS CONSIDERED FOR PY 89
WORKSHEET

Before PY 85 the departure points were set at CETA average performance levels with the expectation that JTPA would perform at least as well as CETA. The PY 85 national departure points were also set at this low (for JTPA) performance level although they were rescaled using the PY 84 terminnee characteristics and economic conditions. PY 86 provided the first opportunity to consider alternative methodologies for selecting departure points with JTPA experience in hand.

Departure points for PY 86 and PY 87 were ultimately set below the previous year's average performance. The 25th percentile was chosen as a point below the PY 84 average expected performance representing a minimally acceptable level of performance. At this level, 75 percent of SDAs should exceed their model-adjusted standards judging from historical performance.

For PY 89, all twelve of the Title II-A measures and the single Title III measure have model departure points identical to the national standards. For most measures, the departure points and national standards have been set at the 25th percentile of expected performance based upon PY 86 experience.

Therefore, SDAs that perform below their model-adjusted standards are underperforming. However, those SDAs that perform above their standards are not necessarily exemplary performers because the

NATIONAL
STANDARDS
AND MODEL
DEPARTURE
POINTS ARE
THE SAME

departure points do not represent average performance. States should keep this in mind when determining their incentive and technical assistance policies.

III. IDENTIFYING EXEMPLARY OR SANCTIONABLE PERFORMANCE IN PY 89

The intent of JTPA is to encourage all SDAs to perform at their best. With departure points set at a minimally acceptable level, Governors may wish to encourage better performance among SDAs that are already satisfactory performers. To do so, they may set ranges of performance above which they grant larger incentives. SDAs/SSAs performing above the standard but below average may receive minimal rewards. Finally, a range can be set within which an SDA barely failing to meet its standard will not be sanctioned.

REVIEW
INCENTIVES
AND T.A.
IN LIGHT OF
"MINIMALLY
ACCEPTABLE"
DEPARTURE
POINTS

The table in Appendix A, Attachment 5 can be used to designate levels of exemplary or nonsanctionable performance for Titles II and III. The values for the percentage chosen by the Governor may be added to the model-adjusted standard to obtain a level of either exemplary or nonsanctionable performance.

Example of Setting a Level of Exemplary Performance for Making Rewards

The State has adopted the DOL adjustment methodology without further adjustments. The Governor

has decided to grant sizeable rewards to SDAs performing at or above the 75th percentile. The table in Appendix A, Attachment 5 shows that SDAs exceeding the 75th percentile should be performing more than 11.3% above their model-derived FER standard.

Model-derived and actual performance for five SDAs in the State is as follows:

<u>SDA</u>	<u>Model-Derived FER</u>		<u>Performance at 75th Percentile</u>	<u>Actual FER</u>
A	58.3	+11.3	69.6	57.8
B	60.0	"	71.3	69.1
C	55.5	"	66.8	71.7
D	60.2	"	71.5	54.8
E	59.2	"	70.5	66.0

The Governor finds that only one SDA—"C"—exceeds the 75th percentile of performance when the 11.3% is added to model-derived performance levels. SDAs "A" and "D" are, in fact, failing their standards.

Example of Setting a Range of Sanctionable Performance

The Governor decided that SDAs barely meeting their minimally acceptable standards should not be eligible for sanctions but SDAs performing below the 20th percentile should be.

The table indicates that SDAs performing 1.2 percentage points below their model predicted standard for the Follow-up Entered Employment Rate would fall into this sanctionable range. Of the SDAs failing their standards in the above example, SDA "A" is not failing enough to be sanctioned, but SDA "D" is eligible for sanctions.

IV. EFFECTS OF THE NEW YEC DEFINITION

The Department has strengthened the definition of youth employment competency attainment to require a minimum of two competency skill area attainments, effective beginning in PY 89. The implementation of this new definition may lower performance on both the positive termination rate (PTR) and the youth employability enhancement rate (YEEN) in the second year of a two-year planning cycle. Nonetheless, the same national standards and model departure points will be in place both years.

For the PTR, the national standard and departure point have been set using the traditional definition of YEC attainments. However, for the YEEN, these levels were set in anticipation of a stricter YEC attainment definition. PY 86 JTQS data showed that, in SDAs with YEC systems in place, 46% of youth terminees attained at least one youth competency. The 30% model departure point seemed a reasonable estimate of the 25th percentile when the attainment of two youth competencies is required.

**YEEN
DEPARTURE
POINT SET
FOR MORE
STRINGENT
YEC DEFINI-
TION**

The effect of these decisions is that the PTR and YEEN standards will seem easy to meet in PY 88, but hard to meet in PY 89 unless SDAs develop programs with multiple skill areas. In keeping with the Department's youth program initiatives, States and SDAs are encouraged to better develop their youth employment competency systems to assure meeting PY 89 standards.

PART F

STEPS FOR VARYING THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
WHEN USING THE MODEL

PART F
STEPS FOR VARYING THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
WHEN USING THE MODEL

I. BASIC CALCULATION STEPS FOR ALL MEASURES

If a Governor elects to use the model to vary the performance standards, there are five basic steps for adjusting each of the standards. These calculation steps are illustrated below using the adult entered employment rate model as an example. Steps for the ratio method used with the Welfare Entered Employment Rate or the Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate are described in Section II.

1. Calculate the SDA Factor Value for each local factor using planning data at the beginning of the program year and actual data (terminee characteristics, percent terminees and updated local economic conditions) at year end for final standards.

**FIVE BASIC
CALCULATION
STEPS**

- a. Calculate the terminnee characteristics separately for the three groups -- adults for adult termination or follow-up models, youths for youth models, and welfare recipients if the welfare model is used. Calculate the SDA's planned or actual total number of terminations for each characteristic as a percent of the planned or actual total number of terminations through the end of the program year. These characteristics of terminees are used for the follow-up

models even though the group of terminees and the follow-up sample differ because of the 13 week lag and sampling.

- b. For the cost models, calculate the percent of participants during the program year who were terminees. This number is calculated by dividing two items on the JASR — the planned or actual number of terminees for the program year by the planned or actual number of participants for PY 89 (including participants carried over into PY 89).
- c. The local economic factors for each SDA are found in Appendix B. Local economic data that are more recent at year end or that better fit the SDA's geographical configuration can be obtained from the State Employment Security Agency (SESA) or in Census sources described in Appendix A, Attachment 2. Enter "7" when the population density is greater than 7000 people per square mile. Using values greater than 7 for highly populated areas will overadjust the impact of population density on outcome measures.

Enter these values on the appropriate lines of "Column G" of the model worksheet.

F. LOCAL FAC-TORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NAT-IONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL ... EXPECTATIONS
% Female	59.0	55.1		-.077	

2. Subtract the National Average ("Column H") for each local factor from "Column G" (SDA Factor Values) being careful with the signs. Enter the results in "Column I".

F. LOCAL FAC- TORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NAT- IONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL ... EXPECTATIONS
% Female	59.0	55.1	3.9	-.077	

3. Multiply "Column I" (the difference between the SDA Factor Value and the corresponding National Average) by "Column J" for each of the local factors. This provides the anticipated "Effect of a Local Factor on Performance Expectations", positive or negative, for each local factor. Enter the result in "Column K".

F. LOCAL FAC- TORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NAT- IONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL ... EXPECTATIONS
% Female	59.0	55.1	3.9	-.077	-.300

4. Sum the "Effects of Local Factors on Performance Expectations" shown in "Column K." Enter the result in Block L.
5. If the total entries in Block L result in a positive number, add it to the Departure Point (Block M). Conversely, if the total result is a negative number, subtract it from the Departure Point. Enter the result in (Block N).

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☒ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Entered Employment Rate (Adult)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female	59.0	55.1	3.9	-.077	-.300
2. % Age 30 and Above	46.0	52.8	-6.8	-.100	+.680
3. % Black	45.0	23.2	21.8	-.047	-1.025
4. % Dropout	30.2	24.8	5.4	-.204	-1.102
5. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	51.1	48.7	2.4	-.062	-.149
6. % Not In Labor Force	9.9	11.9	-2.0	-.116	+.232
7. % AFDC Recipient	37.5	23.8	13.7	-.124	-1.699
8. % GA/RCA Recipient	6.6	5.2	1.4	-.207	-.290
9. Unemployment Rate	8.5	7.4	1.1	-.597	-.657
10. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	14.3	12.5	1.8	-.406	-.731
11. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade	-5.3	0.2	-5.5	.110	-.605
L. Total					- 5.646
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					68.0
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					62.35
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

The initial steps in the adjustment process have been completed.

II. STEPS TO CALCULATE THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR THE WELFARE ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE AND
THE WELFARE FOLLOW-UP EMPLOYMENT RATE

Two alternative methods are offered for adjusting the welfare entered employment rate and the welfare follow-up employment rate. Governors may elect either method but must apply the same method for the same measure in all SDAs in the State. Method I uses a worksheet and instructions similar to the adult and youth measures. Method II uses the State ratio of the welfare entered employment rate or follow-up employment rate to the adult entered employment rate or adult follow-up employment rate.

Method II requires the use of additional data shown in Appendix B. For each State the appendix provides the following values:

- ° The ratio of the welfare entered employment rate to the entered employment rate for adults.
- ° The ratio of the welfare follow-up employment rate to the follow-up employment rate for adults.

These ratios were derived using JTPA PY 87 JASR data as follows:

Welfare entered employment rate ratio:

**DETERMINING
THE STATE
WELFARE
RATIOS**

- ° The State welfare entered employment rate was computed, i.e., the number of adult welfare recipients who entered employment as a percentage of the number of adult welfare recipients who terminated;
- ° The State adult entered employment rate was computed, i.e., total number of adults who entered employment as a percentage of the total number of adults who terminated; and
- ° The welfare entered employment rate was divided by the adult entered employment rate. The result of this last step is the State welfare entered employment rate ratio.

The welfare follow-up employment rate ratio was calculated similarly.

In a few instances, the welfare follow-up employment rate ratio is 1.00 or greater. This is possible when the percentage of welfare recipients employed at follow-up is higher than the percent of all adult respondents employed at follow-up.

**CALCULATION
STEPS FOR
WELFARE
RATIO
METHOD**

When calculating the performance level for the welfare entered employment rate, the data provided in Appendix B should be used in conjunction with the Model-Adjusted Performance Level for the adult entered employment rate (using the steps in the previous section). The appropriate State welfare entered employment rate ratio is multiplied by the Model-Adjusted Performance Level for the adult entered employment rate for each SDA. Consider the following example:

- ° A State's welfare entered employment rate ratio is .55.
- ° The SDA's Model-Adjusted Performance Level for the adult entered employment rate is 60.6%.
- ° This 60.6% multiplied by .55 equals 33.3%.
- ° This represents the SDA's Performance Standard for the adult welfare entered employment rate unless the Governor then wishes to take into consideration a tolerance level adjustment, additional circumstances not accounted for in the model, or a productivity improvement factor.

(Form Facsimile)

1.	Model-Adjusted Performance Level for Adult Entered Employment Rate	<u>60.6%</u>
2.	State Welfare Entered Employment Rate Ratio	<u>.55</u>
3.	SDA Welfare Entered Employment Rate	<u>33.3%</u>
N.	Model-Adjusted Performance Level	<u>33.3%</u>
O.	Governor's Adjustment	<u>2.0</u>
P.	SDA Performance Standard	<u>35.3%</u>

Similarly, the model-adjusted Performance Level for the adult follow-up employment rate is multiplied by the State welfare follow-up employment ratio in calculating SDA Performance Standards for the welfare follow-up employment rate.

**PY 89 RATIO
INAPPROPRIATE
FOR WEER
RECALCULATION**

When recalculating the performance levels for the welfare entered employment rate or the welfare follow-up employment rate at the end of PY 89, either use the statewide ratio data provided in Appendix B or a new statewide ratio calculated from PY 88 data in conjunction with the recalculated adult statewide entered employment or follow-up employment rates. If the Governor elects to use new ratios based on PY 88 data, they should be provided early in the program year to all SDAs in the State. Using the PY 89 ratio of the welfare rates to the adult rates is inappropriate because the PY 89 welfare standards would then depend on actual welfare performance in the same year.

**USE OF STATE
RATIO ONLY**

Again in PY 89 the Governor does not have the option of using the SDA ratio. Recall that the SDA ratio used in previous program years was based upon an SDA's previous experience placing welfare recipients. Such a ratio was predicated on the assumption that an SDA that performs particularly well one year is expected to continue to do well in the future.

In a standard-setting context, however, the use of the SDA ratio results in perpetuating a low standard for "poor performers" and a high one for "good performers". Thus, to improve statewide performance and to ensure a more equitable approach, States are now required to use statewide ratios when setting welfare standards via the ratio method.

III. OPTIONS FOR GOVERNOR TO CONSIDER AFTER INITIAL CALCULATION STEPS

At this point in the calculation process for SDA standards, the Governors have several options:

- ° They may designate the adjusted number as the SDA's Performance Standard;
- ° They may further adjust the model results upward or downward within the designated acceptable tolerance limits to allow for statistical imprecision in the model;
- ° They may further adjust the model results to take into consideration additional circumstances described in the following section; and/or
- ° They may apply a performance improvement factor that responds to the Department's expectation that in a performance-driven system, program outcomes under JTPA will continue to improve.

PART G

FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR

PART G
FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR

I. INTRODUCTION

Section 106(e) of JTPA provides that each Governor may prescribe, within parameters established by the Secretary, variations in the performance standards based upon specific economic, geographic and demographic factors in the State and in service delivery areas/substate areas within the State, the characteristics of the population to be served, and the type of services to be provided.

<—

The Department recognizes that the PY 89 update of the adjustment methodology may require planning revisions. For SDAs currently operating under two-year job training plans, performance standards may have already been set utilizing the planning instructions for PY 88. For PY 89, States will have the option of using either PY 88 performance standards worksheets issued in TEIN No. 27-87 or the revised PY 89 performance standards worksheets issued in TEIN No. 19-88. For new Title III programs, performance standards worksheets are provided for use in PY 89.

<—

The models describe a minimally acceptable level of performance at which about 75% of the SDAs would be expected to exceed their standards. Actual performance varies above and below the model-derived standard for a number of reasons. Variation in performance can result not only from factors within the SDA's control that are not and

should not be modeled, but also from additional factors outside an SDA's control that are not included in the model but should be. Factors within the SDA's control that should not be adjusted include differences in management practices. Some factors outside the SDA's control that could be adjusted are listed later in the chapter. In addition the model can be adjusted within a prescribed tolerance range to account for variation arising from statistical imprecision.

Governors should develop a policy for permissible adjustments. This policy should specify the nature of the problem, the evidence of the mitigating circumstances, and the probable effects of adjustments to SDA expected performance. The relationship between the remedy and the problem should be clear. Similar remedies should be available to any SDA in the same situation.

Adjustments that are not recommended include changes in the national departure points or the factor weights. In particular, changing the factor weights may violate the Secretary's parameters because some SDAs' standards would be over-adjusted and others underadjusted on that factor.

Several circumstances in which variations from one or more of the model-adjusted levels for an SDA may be desirable are indicated below. The list is not all inclusive, but merely provides examples of unique local conditions or events over which an SDA has no control, yet may have a significant positive or negative effect on performance:

- ° Imprecision in the adjustment models;

- ° Extreme local factor values and/or extreme model-adjusted performance levels;
- ° Service to hard-to-serve participant groups not included in the models;
- ° Problems relating to program design, including:
 - Local constraints regarding program mix; and
 - Especially long or intensive programs; and
- ° Further differences in local economic conditions, such as:
 - Regional variations; and
 - Other mitigating factors including plant openings or closings and natural disasters.

II. GOVERNOR'S ADJUSTMENT WITHIN TOLERANCE RANGES

The tolerance range for each performance measure represents the average amount of imprecision in the models. The size of the tolerance level is related to how much the SDA's performance varies from the average in the sample used to estimate the models. The greater the variation among SDAs, the larger the average tolerance range will be for that measure. Hence, for those measures with large tolerance ranges, the model provides less accurate predictions of SDA performance.

Governors, therefore, should pay particular attention to the model results of those measures that have the largest tolerance ranges (the cost and youth measures). Adjustments to the model-derived performance levels for these measures may be necessary because of the unknown extent to which factors not included in the models account for outcomes, i.e., services to hard-to-place adults and in-school youth.

Because the tolerance ranges are expressed in absolute numbers, the amount of the adjustment does not change with the SDA's predicted performance. Adjustments for SDAs with higher predicted performance are the same as adjustments allowed for SDAs with lower predicted performance.

←---

The following table indicates the tolerance ranges for each Title II-A measure and the new Title III measures. Tolerance ranges for Title II-A measures are unchanged from PY 88.

PY 89 Tolerance Range Adjustments

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>Tolerance Range</u>
<u>Title II-A</u>	
Adults	
Entered employment rate	+ 3.5 percentage points
Welfare entered employment rate	+ 3.8 percentage points
Average wage at placement	+ \$0.17
Cost per entered employment	+ \$400
Youth	
Entered employment rate	+ 4.3 percentage points
Positive termination rate	+ 3.4 percentage points
Cost per positive termination	+ \$310
Employability enhancement rate	+ 5.6 percentage points
Follow-up	
Adult follow-up employment rate	+ 4.2 percentage points
Welfare follow-up employment rate	+ 5.1 percentage points
Weeks worked in follow-up period	+ 0.5 weeks
Weekly earnings of all employed at follow-up	+ \$14
<u>Title III</u>	
Adults	
—> Entered employment rate	+ 3.4 percentage points
Average wage at placement	+ \$0.38

NOTE: Variation among SDAs has decreased; yet to allow for some sampling error in follow-up performance ranges, a larger confidence interval--99.9%--has been used for the tolerance limits in PY 88-89 than was used for PY 86-87 (99%).

In addition to accounting for statistical imprecision, tolerance range adjustments are used in two other ways. First, they can be used to provide an additional lenient adjustment for SDAs facing extreme service conditions. Second, they provide a range of acceptable performance within which Governors can adjust SDA standards for factors not included in the model without providing documentation for the additional adjustment. This range of acceptable performance may also be used to establish the bounds for making rewards and identifying technical assistance needs.

OTHER
USES OF
TOLERANCE
RANGES

Performance standards set anywhere within the specified tolerance range are acceptable model-derived performance expectations and, as such, meet the Secretary's parameters. Because no documentation is required for adjusting anywhere within this range, a Governor may prefer using the tolerance range itself rather than a point estimate in setting an SDA's performance standard.

TOLERANCE
ADJUSTMENTS
MEET
SECRETARY'S
PARAMETERS

III. EXTREME FACTOR VALUES

Although the adjustment models produce meaningful performance standards for a large majority of

SDAs, under some circumstances the results may be unacceptably extreme. Governors should examine each SDA's model adjusted performance levels for reasonableness. Some performance levels, especially those resulting from extreme factor values, may at first appear unreasonable but are not.

Extreme model-predicted performance levels usually occur when SDAs have combinations of very high or low proportions of terminée characteristics and very favorable or unfavorable local economic conditions. If the model-predicted performance level is extreme, or two or more of the local factors are extreme, the Governor may consider applying a wider tolerance range adjustment to make the standard more lenient. In particular, SDAs that have been excluded from the sample used for model development, because of their extreme circumstances, may need such adjustments. These SDAs are listed in Appendix A, Attachment 4.

The following table identifies extreme performance expectations and are unchanged from PY 88 with the exception of the new Title III measures.

<---

Extreme Model-Derived Performance Outcomes

Title II-A

<u>Adult Standards</u>	<u>Extreme Values</u>	
Entered employment rate	<55%	>80%
Welfare entered employment rate	<44%	>66%
Cost per entered employment	<\$2,900	>\$6,100
Wage at placement	<\$3.77	>\$6.30

Youth Standards

Entered employment rate	<16%	>72%
Positive termination rate	<69%	>81%
Cost per positive termination	<\$3,800	>\$5,900
Employability enhancement rate	<11%	>49%

Follow-up Standards

Follow-up employment rate	<45%	>72%
Welfare follow-up employment rate	<34%	>66%
Weeks worked in follow-up period	<6.4	>9.4
Weekly earnings of all employed at follow-up	<\$132	>\$225

Title III

Adult Standards

Entered employment rate	<45%	>85%
Wage at placement	<\$5.00	>\$9.50

These values indicate the range within which at least 98% of the SDAs' expected performance would fall given the distribution of SDA factor values that prevailed in PY 86. The extremes for the Title III wage at placement assume that the departure point has been set at the 40th percentile (\$7.08) by the Governor.

Extreme terminnee characteristics and local conditions are presented below. These tables identify the high and low extreme values, representing the lowest 1% and highest 1% of factor values that prevailed in PY 86.

EXTREME VALUES OF LOCAL FACTORS FOR ADULT MEASURES

<u>Local Factor</u>	<u>Extremely low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	<34	> 79
Percent 30 or More Years Old	<38	> 68
Percent Black	-	> 85
Percent Hispanic	-	> 85
Percent Dropout	< 8	> 50
Percent Post High School Attendee	< 6	> 53
Percent UC Claimant	-	> 26
Percent Unemployed 15 or More Weeks	< 4	> 85
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 53
Percent AFDC Recipient	< 7	> 48
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 30
Percent of Participants that Terminated	<45	-
Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Percent Families Below Poverty Level	< 3	> 26
Population Density ¹	-	N/A
Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	<57	>187
Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture	< 6	> 49
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	<-12	> 18

* Real earnings meaning inflation-adjusted earnings.

EXTREME VALUES OF LOCAL FACTORS FOR WELFARE MEASURE

<u>Local Factor</u>	<u>Extremely low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	<40	-
Percent Black	-	> 96
Percent Dropout	< 9	> 59
Percent Unemployed 15 or More Weeks	< 5	> 94
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 77
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 59
Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture	< 6	> 49
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	<-12	> 18

EXTREME VALUES OF LOCAL FACTORS FOR YOUTH MEASURES

<u>Local Factor</u>	<u>Extremely low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	<33	> 70
Percent 14-15 years old	-	> 38
Percent 16-17 years old	< 4	> 61
Percent Black	-	> 93
Percent Hispanic	-	> 89
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	-	> 24
Percent Dropout	< 5	> 60
Percent Student	-	> 80

Percent Post High School Attendee	-	> 28
Percent Handicapped	-	> 59
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 84
Percent AFDC Recipient	< 4	> 50
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 22
Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Percent Families Below Poverty Level	< 3	> 26
Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	<57	>187
Population Density (1000s/sq.mi) ¹	-	N/A
Percent of Participants that Terminated	<37	-
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	<-12	> 18

* Real earnings meaning inflation-adjusted earnings.

Note: Where local factors have extreme values at only the high end of the range, any value below this will be considered reasonable.

¹Because population density is capped, there are no extreme values at the high end of the distribution.

More recent data (1986) were used to compute the population density factor.

Unlike the tolerance ranges listed previously that represent model imprecision for the average SDA, the following expanded tolerance ranges represent the imprecision of the model for SDAs

with factors in the extreme ranges. For SDAs having two or more extreme local factor values, use the following tolerance ranges:

**EXTREME
CHARACTER-
ISTICS—
USE WIDER
TOLERANCE
ADJUSTMENT**

Adults

Entered Employment Rate	+ 4.6
Average Wage at Placement	+ \$0.22
Cost per Entered Employment	+ \$530
Welfare Entered Employment Rate	+ 4.7

Youth

Entered Employment Rate	+ 5.6
Employability Enhancement Rate	+ 6.5
Positive Termination Rate	+ 4.9
Cost per Positive Termination	+ \$410

Postprogram

Follow-up Employment Rate	+ 5.4
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate	+ 6.4
Weeks Worked in the Follow-up Period	+ 0.6
Weekly Earnings of all Employed at Follow-up	+ \$18

Current data are insufficient to develop extreme values for Title III.

The adjustments for extreme characteristics can be entered on Line A of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" presented shortly. These expanded tolerance range adjustments should not be used as an addition to the usual tolerance range adjustments—they replace them!

After reviewing the local factors and performance outcomes for extremes, compare SDAs' job training plans with the FY 89 worksheets to determine if the models adequately account for:

- ° specific groups the SDA intends to serve;
and
- ° local economic conditions.

If service is planned for hard-to-serve groups missing from the worksheets, additional adjustments for such groups may be warranted. These adjustments are described in Section IV below. If there are local economic conditions which are not adequately explained by the economic factors contained on the worksheet, Section V below describes procedures Governors may follow.

IV. TARGET GROUPS OR TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS NOT INCLUDED IN MODEL

Governors may want to adjust SDAs' standards for serving hard-to-serve groups not included in the model. The preferable method of adjusting for additional characteristics of hard-to-serve groups requires:

- (1) the percent of JTPA terminees in the target group for each SDA,
- (2) an estimate of the percent of JTPA terminees in the target group nationwide. National averages for some terminnee characteristics have been estimated

from the Job Training Quarterly Survey (JTQS) and are provided below. In the absence of national averages, a statewide estimate derived from the State MIS system may be used.

- (3) a weight representing the effect of the local factor on the performance outcome taking all other factors into consideration. Some weights estimated using the JTQS data are given below; others may be obtained using the methodology explained on page G-33. An alternative adjustment methodology is provided that can be used when no information for estimating a weight is available.

A. Factors excluded from the models that do not warrant adjustments

During the model-building process, all characteristics available on the PY 87 JASR were examined for inclusion in the model. Some variables were excluded for the following reasons:

- ° The factor(s) was redundant with other more important local factors already included in the model.
- ° The statistical analysis showed unexpected results, opposite to the believed impact of the factor(s).
- ° Although the factor(s) is generally believed to be important for individual

outcomes, all SDAs are serving similar proportions of such hard-to-serve groups. Thus, the appropriate adjustments would be similar for all SDAs.

Generally PY 87 JASR characteristics excluded from the worksheets do not warrant further adjustments. (Racial characteristics for SDAs serving minorities are an exception as discussed later.) The Governor may, however, count such factors toward the 2 or more extreme characteristics that warrant an expanded tolerance range adjustment even when the factors do not appear in the worksheets.

Adjustments to the model are not recommended when factors are redundant with those already in the model. Additional adjustments to any factors redundant with those already in the model could double the appropriate adjustment. Because of redundancy with variables already in the model, additional adjustments are generally not needed for:

- ° single head of household, and
- ° limited English-speaking.

"Limited English-speaking" is highly correlated with the racial/ethnic groupings.

"Single head of household" is highly correlated with "Female" and "Welfare recipient".

REDUNDANT
FACTORS—
DO NOT
ADJUST

←

INCON-
SISTENT
RESULTS—
DO NOT
ADJUST

Other factors are excluded because the statistical models suggested that the groups were easier to serve rather than harder to serve as expected. Because the intent of JTPA is to encourage service to groups viewed as hard-to-serve, the models were reestimated excluding such variables. Governors should not make additional adjustments to standards based on factors having counterintuitive results; their absence in the models already adjusts for these groups.

Some factors are not in the models because including them yielded insignificant adjustments. Their weights were essentially zero. Zero weights occur in JASR-based models not only when factors are unimportant, but also when SDAs serve very similar proportions of hard-to-serve groups. When there is not much variation across SDA service levels, additional adjustments for such factors is generally unnecessary and will result in negligible changes in performance expectations. However, when an SDA plans to target a group or has actual service levels beyond the normal range, use of an expanded tolerance range adjustment is warranted.

The table that follows shows racial/ethnic factors that may be used for additional adjustments even though they have been omitted from the models.

Ethnic Factors Excluded From Models Because of Unexpected or Small Effects

	Adult Models				Youth Models				Postprogram Models			
	EER	AWP	CEE	WEER	YEER	YEEN	PTR	CPT	AFER	FWW	FWE	WFER
Hispanic	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x
Alaskan Native/ American Indian	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Asian/Pacific Islander	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x

A continuing problem with the statistical analyses undertaken to develop the adjustment models is that the individual racial ethnic groups often have either small or counterintuitive estimated adjustment weights. These small and/or counterintuitive weights arise because some racial groups are relatively uncommon and tend to be concentrated in specific regions. As a result, it is difficult to distinguish the effects of the relatively uncommon ethnic groups from the effects of regional economic conditions not included in the models.

**RACIAL/ETHNIC
CHARACTER-
ISTICS MAY BE
ADJUSTED**

←

Because of these problems, some individual racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Asians, Hispanics) have often been excluded from many of the adjustment models. As a result, SDAs do not receive any adjustment to their standards for serving these groups--that is these groups are treated like whites when calculating performance standards. A Technical Workgroup reviewed alternative models that contained a

←

single adjustment weight for "all minority" groups combined (Black, Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Indian and Native American). Models with a single "all minority" factor were found to be nearly comparable statistically as the models that were chosen for PY 89, which include only those racial/ethnic groups with large weights in the expected direction. For most models, the "all minority" factor had a somewhat smaller adjustment weight than the weight for the individual racial/ethnic groups that were included in the DOL models (e.g., Blacks). A single "all minority" factor is provided so that Governors can choose this alternative if appropriate for their State.

The table below presents national averages and weights to determine the amount of the additional adjustments needed when the "all minority" factor is used. Estimated adjustment weights for the other local factors are not substantially affected by whether or not the individual ethnic groups or a combined minority group are included in the model. Thus, States can choose to use these weights for each minority group excluded from the model (refer to G-17) and continue to use the adjustment weight for those minority groups included in each model.

←

**NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR
ADJUSTMENTS FOR COMBINED MINORITY GROUP**

	<u>National Averages</u>	<u>Model Weights</u>
<u>Adults</u>	34.8%	
Entered-employment rate		-.032
Wage at placement		-.0037

	<u>National Averages</u>	<u>Model Weights</u>
Cost per entered employment		0.9
Follow-up employment rate		-.078
Follow-up weeks worked		-.010
Weekly earnings of those employed at follow-up		-.060
<u>Welfare adults</u>	43.5%	
Entered-employment rate		-.027
Follow-up employment rate		-.104
<u>Youth</u>	41.0%	
Entered-employment rate		-.048
Positive-termination rate		-.052
Cost per positive termination		1.3
Employability enhancement rate		--

Again, if the Governor elects to adjust for racial/ethnic characteristics, every SDA planning to serve these groups must have the opportunity to receive an adjustment.

**B. Adjustments for Factors not available on
PY 87 JASR**

**1. Using data from the JTQS to make
adjustments**

Model-derived performance levels will not adequately adjust for service to all groups that have special employment impediments, sometimes resulting in unreasonably high performance expectations. An alternative data source to the JASR, the JTQS, includes

more detailed terminnee characteristics and performance outcome information on special target groups, e.g., displaced homemakers. This information was used to derive weights to make additional adjustments for terminnee characteristics and special target groups not included in the federal reporting system.

The table below provides national averages and weights that can be used to determine the amount of the additional adjustments needed. This information can be entered into the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" which is provided at the end of this section.

Follow the instructions in the table when including adjustments for combinations of factors. For example, either "Single Head of Household" or "Female Parent" may be included as adjustments beyond the model, but not both. "Displaced Homemaker", for example, can be used in combination with any other factors--"Female Parent or Multiple Barriers."

This year adjustment weights have been developed for terminees with multiple barriers (3 or more) for adults, welfare adults, and youth.

—> This variable is the percentage of terminees who had three or more of the following barriers to employment:

Adult	Adult Welfare	Youth
Black	Black	Black
Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic
Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian or Pacific Islander	Asian or Pacific Islander
American Indian or Alaskan Native	American Indian or Alaskan Native	American Indian or Alaskan Native
Female	Female	Female
Age 55 or over	Age 55 or over	
School dropout	School dropout	School dropout
Limited English language proficiency	Limited English language proficiency	Limited English language proficiency
Handicapped	Handicapped	Handicapped
Offender	Offender	Offender
Unemployed 15 or more of the previous 26 weeks	Unemployed 15 or more of the previous 26 weeks	Unemployed 15 or more of the previous 26 weeks
Not in Labor Force	Not in Labor Force	
Single head of household	Single head of household	Single head of household
AFDC recipient		AFDC recipient
GA/RCA recipient		GA/RCA recipient

States continuing to use the PY 88 models should use the additional adjustments in the PY 88 TAG.

NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS--ADULTS

		<u>Adjustment Weight</u>	
	<u>PY 86 National Average</u>	<u>Entered- Employment Rate</u>	<u>Wage at Placement</u>
Displaced homemaker	5.4%	-.064	--
Veteran	14.5%	-.030	.0042
Female parent	38.1%	--	-.0010
Multiple barriers (3 or more)	42.4%	-.023	-.0020

NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS--ADULTS RECEIVING WELFARE

	<u>PY 86 National Average</u>	<u>Adjustment Weight for Entered- Employment Rate</u>
Displaced homemaker	10.6%	-.114
Veteran	7.4%	-.057
Multiple barriers (3 or more)	66.9%	-.057
Family status		
With only one factor included:		
Single head of household	59.7%	-.018
Female parent	63.1%	-.007

NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS—YOUTH

		<u>Adjustment Weight</u>		
	<u>PY 86 National Average</u>	<u>Entered- Employment Rate</u>	<u>Positive- Termination Rate</u>	<u>Employability Enhancement Rate</u>
Multiple barriers (3 or more)	21.8%	-.013	-.052	--
Family status				
With only one factor included:				
Teenage parent	7.2%	-.041	--	--
Female teenage parent	6.4%	-.064	--	--
Single head of household	11.8%	-.056	-.090	-.021

No additional adjustments appear in the preceding tables for cost and follow-up measures. This is because the JTQS data does not contain information on costs or outcomes at follow-up. Thus, for SDAs needing adjustments for these factors, Governors should seek some alternative means of adjusting cost and follow-up measures. In the future, however, JTQS data can be linked to the JASR data to obtain additional adjustments for all models.

Program activities have been excluded from the model so that SDAs are accountable for their choice of program activities. However, the Governor may decide that adjustments for program activity are appropriate. Such adjustments may be particularly appropriate when SDAs use the model to develop performance goals for their subcontractors, as discussed in Section H.

**ADJUSTMENTS
FOR PROGRAM
ACTIVITY**

Factor weights to adjust for program activity have been estimated using the JTQS data. The program activities represent the proportion of terminees who ever participated in an activity. Thus, individuals who receive more than one service are counted in more than one category. The job-search assistance is an exception—it represents the proportion of terminees who received only job-search assistance. Weights are presented for the following categories:

- ° Received job search assistance only,
(including job counseling)
- ° Ever received classroom training--basic
education
- ° Ever received classroom training--occu-
pational skills
- ° Ever received on-the-job training
- ° Ever received work experience
- ° Other activities

In addition categories of longer term training have been defined:

<—

- ° Classroom training in occupational skills
for 26 or more weeks

- ° Classroom training (in either occupational skills or in basic education) for 26 or more weeks

Models have been estimated to support several methods of adjusting for program activity:

←

- ° Adjustments for all the different program activities without an adjustment for longer term training.
- ° Adjustments for all the different program activities with a further adjustment for longer term training in occupational skills.
- ° An adjustment only for classroom training in basic education.
- ° An adjustment for classroom training in basic education with a further adjustment for longer term training in occupational skills.
- ° An adjustment only for longer term classroom training (in either occupational skills and/or basic education).

The national averages and weights needed to make these adjustments are provided in the tables that follow.

**NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITY—ADULTS**

		<u>Adjustment Weight</u>	
	<u>PY 86 National Average</u>	<u>Entered- Employment Rate</u>	<u>Wage at Placement</u>
With all six factors included:			
Job-search assistance only	22.9%	.210	-.0035
Classroom training			
basic education	9.6%	-.183	-.0024
Occupational skills	29.2%	.025	.0025
On-the-job training	28.8%	.177	-.0013
Work experience	4.3%	.028	-.0036
Other activities	10.9%	.114	-.0009

The following factor may be included in addition to the above six factors:

Classroom training			
Occupational skills			
26 weeks or longer	12.1%	-.119	.0008

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training			
basic education	9.6%	-.288	-.0008

The following factor may be included in addition to the above single factor, classroom training in basic education:

Classroom training			
Occupational skills			
26 weeks or longer	12.1%	-.197	.0039

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training			
26 weeks or longer	14.2%	-.249	.0036

NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITY—ADULTS RECEIVING WELFARE

	<u>PY 86 National Average</u>	<u>Adjustment Weight for Entered- Employment Rate</u>
With all six factors included:		
Job-search assistance only	19.0%	.279
Classroom training		
basic education	14.6%	-.204
Occupational skills	35.4%	.058
On-the-job training	19.0%	.238
Work experience	5.2%	.140
Other activities	13.0%	.140

The following factor may be included
in addition to the above six factors:

Classroom training		
Occupational skills		
26 weeks or longer	16.9%	-.112

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training		
basic education	14.6%	-.335

The following factor may be included
in addition to the above single factor,
classroom training in basic education:

Classroom training		
Occupational skills		
26 weeks or longer	16.9%	-.190

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training		
26 weeks or longer	20.8%	-.231

**NATIONAL AVERAGES AND SUGGESTED WEIGHTS FOR ADJUSTMENTS
FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITY—YOUTH**

		Adjustment Weight		
	PY 86 National Average	Entered- Employment Rate	Positive Termination Rate	Employ- ability Enhance- ment Rate
With all six factors included:				
Job-search assistance				
only	17.5%	.144	.089	.108
Classroom training				
basic education	16.8%	-.095	.006	.123
Occupational skills	20.0%	.062	-.051	-.032
On-the-job training	16.1%	.207	.040	-.098
Work experience	16.9%	.010	.037	-.001
Other activities	21.8%	.066	.043	.057

The following factor may be included in addition to the above six factors:

Classroom training				
Occupational skills				
26 weeks or longer	9.4%	-.048	--	--

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training				
basic education	16.8%	-.174	-.027	.094

The following factor may be included in addition to the above single factor, classroom training in basic education:

Classroom training				
Occupational skills				
26 weeks or longer	9.4%	-.074	-.052	--

As the only program factor included:

Classroom training				
26 weeks or longer	13.3%	-.094	-.056	--

A worksheet to make these additional adjustments is presented below. To complete this worksheet, enter:

**WORKSHEET
FOR
ADDITIONAL
ADJUSTMENTS**

- ° the percent of JTPA terminees in the target group for each SDA in Column G as SDA Factor Values;
- ° the National Averages in Column H; and
- ° the Factor Weights in Column J on this worksheet.

[illegible][illegible]

Follow the usual procedures for completing Performance Standards Worksheets, Columns F through K. Enter any other additional adjustments in the section so labeled (Lines A through F). Sum all additional adjustments in Column K entering the total on Line O, "Governor's Adjustment" on both this form and the Performance Standards Worksheet.

2. Using State MIS data to make adjustments

Certain target groups--e.g. substance abusers--are not identified in the JTQS; hence, alternate sources of performance information are needed for considering additional adjustments. If the State collects information on these target groups in its MIS system, that system can be a valuable source of information for making adjustments to account for groups or sub-group characteristics not included in the model and unavailable from other national data sources.

The MIS system can provide the following information on the target group for both deriving the factor weights and completing the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model":

i. Information for Deriving Factor Weights:

- ° State Factor Values on all the local factors included in the model for those

terminees in the target group based on historical data; and

- ° An actual performance level for the target group. This should be estimated from historical data for the same group of terminees used for calculating the State factor values.

ii. Information for Adjustments Beyond the Model:

- ° A national or statewide percentage of JTPA terminees in the target group, and
- ° The percent of JTPA terminees in the target group for each SDA.

FIRST
DETERMINE—
DO SDAs
VARY?

In considering additional adjustments, the Governor should first determine if the target group service levels or local economic conditions vary from one SDA to another. Even though the statewide local factors differ from national averages, additional adjustments may not be necessary unless differences among SDAs occur within the State. When the State differs from the national average but no intra-state differences occur, applying an additional adjustment will raise or lower all SDAs' standards without differentiating between SDAs.

IS TARGET
GROUP
PERFORMANCE
LOWER?

The Governor should also examine whether the actual performance level for the target group is lower than model-predicted performance for at least some SDAs in the State.

Further, at least 50, and preferably more than 100, target group members are needed (statewide) to derive a factor weight.

**MINIMUM
TARGET GROUP
SIZE OF 50**

The recommended method for calculating an adjustment weight compares the actual statewide target group performance with the model predicted target group performance based on the characteristics of the group that are included in the model.

A blank worksheet illustrates using this methodology to derive the factor weight. General instructions for developing and completing such worksheets are given below.

**General Instructions for the
Performance Standards Worksheet for
Deriving a Factor Weight for a Target Group**

The worksheet and instructions are illustrated using the model for Average Wage at Placement. Depending on the specific measure being adjusted, substitute the appropriate Performance Standards Worksheet (e.g. EER, PTR, FER, etc.) for Blocks F through N of the sample worksheet for "Deriving Factor Weights".

(NOTE: If additional adjustments are to be made using terminee characteristics from the JTQS data, those national averages and weights provided in the TAG should also be included on the worksheet for "Deriving Factor Weights". If adjustments are to be made for more than one target group where

**ADJUSTING
FOR MORE
THAN ONE
TARGET
GROUP**

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet for Deriving Factor Weights				A. Target Group	B. State
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard () Plan () Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Average Wage at Placement		
F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. STATE FACTOR VALUES FOR TARGET GROUP ONLY	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		55.1		-.0078	
2. % Age 30 and Above		52.8		.0041	
3. % Black		23.2		-.0058	
4. % Dropout		24.8		-.0145	
5. % UC Claimant		10.3		.0210	
6. Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		48.7		-.0011	
7. Annual Earnings in Wholesale and Retail Trade (000)		12.5		.0788	
8. Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)		0.7		.0776	
9. Employee/Resident Worker Ratio		99.9		-.0044	
10. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		-.0245	
11. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.0407	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted (Minimally Acceptable) Performance Level (L + M)					
Q. Rescaling Departure Point to the National Average Performance					
R. Model-Derived AVERAGE Performance for the Target Group (N + Q)					
S. Actual Target Group Performance Level, Statewide					
T. DIFFERENCE between Expected and Actual Performance (R - S)					
U. Weight for Target Group (- T / 100)					

the factor weight is derived using the method below, the adjustments must be made sequentially. That is, after deriving the weight for the first target group, add the first target group and its derived weight to the list of local factors and proceed to derive the weight of the second target group.)

- ° In Column G, enter the **State** Factor Values for the target group only (i.e., not for all SDA terminees as is usually done in calculating SDA standards);
- ° complete Blocks H through N as usual;
- ° complete Blocks Q through U using the following specific instructions:

Specific Instructions for Blocks Q through U:

1) Block Q -- Rescaling

Enter the appropriate value for the performance measure below:

Entered Employment Rate	5.0%
Average Wage at Placement	\$.14
Cost per Entered Employment	-\$1,538
Welfare Entered Employment Rate	7.8%
Youth Entered Employment Rate	7.9%
Positive Termination Rate	5.6%
Cost per Positive Termination	-\$2,502

Youth Employability Enhancement	16.3%
Follow-up Employment Rate	5.4%
Weeks Worked at Follow-up	.6
Weekly Earnings at Follow-up	\$13
Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate	4.5%

These values represent the difference between the PY 86 national average performance and the departure points in the PY 88 models. They, therefore, rescale the performance level from a minimally acceptable, i.e., the lowest quartile, to the average performance.

2) Block R -- Model-Derived AVERAGE Performance

Add Blocks N (the target group's model-adjusted performance at a minimally acceptable level) and Q to obtain the average expected performance based on model-included characteristics of the target group.

3) Block S -- Actual Target Group Performance Level

Enter the estimate, preferably statewide, of the target group's actual performance level in Block S.

4) Block T -- Difference

Find the difference between the target group actual performance and model-derived average performance (Block R minus Block S).

5) Block U -- Factor Weight

To obtain the adjustment weight, change the sign of the value in Block T and divide by 100. Enter the result in Block U and in Column J of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model".

This worksheet need be completed only once for each State; however, one such worksheet must be completed for each target group and for each performance measure.

After the adjustment weight is derived, then the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" can be used to adjust each SDA's performance standards for serving the target group. On that worksheet, the factor weight should be entered in Column J. Enter the other information obtained from the MIS system on the worksheet--the statewide percentage of JTPA terminees in the target group in Column H, and the percent of JTPA terminees in the target group for each SDA in Column G.

3. Making adjustments when neither JTQS or Statewide data is available

In the absence of any State MIS data or national historical data, a weighted average approach may be used to adjust performance standards for serving special groups. The

previous method is much preferred to this one, however, because other terminee characteristics are taken into account before the target group adjustment is made. The method below could result in an accidental double adjustment because hard-to-serve participants have other hard-to-serve characteristics which are already accounted for in the model. Thus, the following method should only be applied when information about the target group's other characteristics is not available.

A Weighted Average Approach Used to Adjust for Special Target Groups

If the State and SDA can agree on a standard for the target group, whether suggested by special surveys or another State's experience, then the total standard for the whole population of terminees can be calculated using the following weighted average formula:

$$\left[\frac{(NT - NG) \times (PO)}{NT} \right] + \left[\frac{NG \times (PG)}{NT} \right] = PT$$

where,

NT = Total expected number of terminees

NG = Expected number of terminees in special
group

PO = Performance standard for all terminees
other than members of special group

(e.g., EER from worksheet using planned characteristics of regular terminees).

PG = Expected performance for terminees in special group

PT = Performance standard for all terminees, including the target group

The adjustment to be entered on Line B of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" is $PT - PO$.

Example of a Target Group Adjustment with No Information to Derive a Model Weight

What would the effect of operating a program for 50 vietnam veterans be if the expected follow-up employment rate for Vietnam veterans were 40% and the expected rate for all other terminees were 70%, given a total of 400 terminees?

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} 350 \times 70.0\% \\ 400 \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{c} 50 \times 40.0\% \\ 400 \end{array} \right] = PT$$

$$61.2\% + 5.0\% = PT$$

$$66.2\% = PT$$

The adjusted expected EER performance is 66.2%. Therefore the adjustment for this target group to be entered on Line B of the "Worksheet for Adjustments Beyond the Model" is

$$66.2 - 70.0 = - 3.8$$

V. LOCAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

A. Additional Local Factors

Many different measures of local economic conditions were tested in developing the model. Yet few of these were useful for inclusion in the models. Because most local economic factors are likely to be highly correlated with the local economic factors already included in the model, and hence redundant, further adjustments based on local economic conditions should be carefully scrutinized.

ADDITIONAL
ADJUSTMENTS
ON LOCAL
ECONOMIC
CONDITIONS
ARE NOT
RECOMMENDED

The local economic factors considered and not included because of redundancy are:

- ° Percent Urban
- ° Percent of employment in services and public administration,

In the absence of any DOL information on factor weights for local economic conditions, the following method that distinguishes between SDAs that have or do not have the local economic condition may be used to adjust performance:

**Residual Method for Adjusting for
Local Economic Factors**

- (1) Divide the SDAs into groups according to whether they have or do not have the specific local condition or according to

the severity of the specific condition. To use this method, it is recommended that each group must have at least ten SDAs in it. To achieve this minimum, more than one State's SDAs can be included in the groupings. Specific SDAs should not, however, be included or excluded arbitrarily from the analysis.

- (2) Obtain both actual performance and model-derived levels of performance for each SDA. Rescale the model-derived level of performance to account for the difference between the national average and the national departure points using the rescaling factors on page G-35.
- (3) Rescale the rescaled model-derived performance from actual performance for each SDA. Call the differences "residuals".
- (4) Take the average of the residuals within each group of SDAs.
- (5) Enter, for each SDA, the average residual of the appropriate group on Line C of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model".

Example of Adjustment for Local Economic
Condition

A State has 5 SDAs—two are located in metropolitan areas with mass transit systems. Three are

located in suburban to rural areas with nominal or no public transportation available. Program experience and evaluation studies show that the availability of public transportation increases the likelihood of JTPA participants remaining in jobs after placement. The State, therefore has decided to adjust its follow-up employment rate for this factor.

The availability of mass transit systems withing the SDA, and their actual and predicted entered employment rates are based on historical data.

<u>SDA</u>	<u>Mass Transit Availability</u>	<u>Actual FER</u>	<u>Model-Derived FER</u>	<u>FER Re-scaling Factor</u>	<u>Rescaled Model-Derived FER</u>	<u>Residual</u>
A	no	54.8	58.3	+ 5.4	63.7	- 8.9
B	partial (no)	69.1	60.0	"	65.4	+ 3.7
C	yes	71.7	55.5	"	60.9	+ 10.8
D	no	54.8	60.2	"	65.6	- 10.8
E	yes	66.0	59.2	"	64.6	+ 1.4

The State obtained similar information for all SDAs in two other States yielding 8 additional SDAs with mass transportation systems and 17 additional SDAs without mass transportation.

The Governor calculated rescaled model-derived performance levels for each SDA by adding the rescaling factor--5.4--to the model-derived FER level.

Rescaled model-derived performance levels were subtracted from the actual performance to obtain residuals.

By averaging the residuals for SDAs in each group, the Governor found the following adjustments:

Group A (with transit system):

$$(10.8 + 1.4 + \dots) / 10 = +2.1$$

Group B (without or partial transit system):

$$(-8.9 + 3.7 - 10.8 + \dots) / 20 = -4.7$$

These adjustments are entered, for each SDA in the State, on the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model", on Line C. The adjusted entered employment rates for the SDAs are as follows:

<u>SDA</u>	<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Adjusted FER</u>
A	58.3 - 4.7	53.6
B	60.0 - 4.7	55.3
C	55.5 + 2.1	57.6
D	60.2 - 4.7	55.5
E	59.2 + 2.1	61.3

B. Federal Regional Variations

Performance varies depending on the federal regions in which the SDA is located. For example, an SDA in Region 10 is likely to have a higher placement rate than an SDA in another region. Because the regional variable minimizes the individual SDA differences within regions, it was excluded from the models. If the Governor chooses to make performance standards more stringent or lenient to account for regional differences in outcomes, the following adjustments can

be made directly to each SDA's model-derived standards. If a regional adjustment is made to one SDA's standards, all other SDAs within the State have to be similarly adjusted.

To make a regional adjustment find the value in the following table for the appropriate region and performance measure and enter it on the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" on Line C.

Regional Effects For PY 89 Models

Region	Adults						Welfare		Youth		
	EER	AWP	CEE	FER	FWW	FWE	WEER	WFER	EER	PTR	CPT
1	-0.3	.44	358	-0.2	0.1	3	0.0	0.4	0.1	-0.4	289
2	2.2	-.03	79	3.4	0.9	-5	2.3	2.6	-0.2	0.3	8
3	-0.4	-.11	165	1.5	-0.2	-3	-0.9	1.5	-3.1	-0.5	268
4	-0.7	-.16	-72	-0.9	-0.1	-2	-0.7	-2.0	2.1	-0.4	23
5	1.0	.05	-223	-0.8	0.1	4	1.4	-0.5	1.3	1.0	-140
6	1.0	.00	109	1.1	0.1	1	1.6	1.8	-1.6	1.1	-68
7	-1.7	-.13	-31	-0.3	-0.2	-24	-3.2	-1.6	-5.1	0.7	-345
8	-3.1	.02	-429	-1.3	-0.1	2	-5.8	-2.7	-3.8	-3.1	-253
9	-2.2	.11	306	-1.9	-0.3	10	-2.5	-1.4	0.4	-1.8	236
10	3.1	-.03	-172	2.8	0.5	7	4.9	6.6	8.0	1.3	3

* Because the YEEN model was developed using JTQS data, no regional information is available.

The regional adjustments given for the PTR and CPT are unchanged from PY 88 because the PY 88 models are continuing in use for these measures.

VI. ADJUSTMENTS FOR PROGRAM DESIGN PROBLEMS

A. Youth Employment Competency System

The Department feels sufficient time has elapsed for SDAs to have established their youth employment competency systems. Thus, Governors are not encouraged to set more lenient positive-termination-rate or employability-enhancement standards for SDAs that do not have any youth competency systems in place or have a pre-employment/work maturity component without the required eleven core competencies.

YOUTH
COMPETENCY
SYSTEM NOT
IN PLACE—
NO
ADJUSTMENT

The more stringent definition of attainment of a youth employment competency in PY 89 will make the PTR and YEEN standards difficult to meet for SDAs that do not develop programs with multiple skill areas. Nonetheless, Governors should not adjust standards because of the PY 89 change in YEC definition.

DO NOT
ADJUST FOR
PY 89
CHANGE IN
YEC DEFINI-
TION

SDAs which will have difficulty meeting PTR and YEEN standards in PY 89 are those SDAs which

- do not have a YEC system;
- have a YEC system with only one or two skill areas;
- have an employment-directed program;
- do not have a pre-employment/work maturity component with required 11 core competencies; or

DO NOT
ADJUST FOR
THESE
PROGRAM
DESIGNS

- do not have proper linkages with educational or vocational education institutions to provide certain job-specific and basic skill training.

Because of the Department's new youth initiatives, none of the above program designs warrant adjustments.

However, some program designs or YEC systems do warrant additional adjustments because they may result in considerable difficulty in meeting the model-adjusted standard for the positive termination rate or employability enhancement rate. Circumstances that may warrant additional adjustments include:

- ° An SDA develops a YEC system that requires the mastery of many specific elements in each competency area. Consequently, a YEC is more difficult for each participant to attain.
- ° An SDA develops a YEC system with a lengthy, comprehensive program and experiences start-up problems. Mostly negative terminations occur during the initial program year while most of the YEC attainments are expected to occur in the following program year.

The weighted average approach for special target groups, presented earlier in this section, can also be used to develop a more reasonable standard in these program design situations: divide the SDAs terminees or

programs into two (or more) groups, determine a reasonable standard for each group, and take a weighted average of the standards using the proportions of terminees in each group as weights.

**The Weighted Average Approach Used to
Adjust for Program Design**

1. First, the SDA should plan what proportion of youth will be served during PY 89 in:
 - ° the usual employability enhancement programs [--this proportion is represented as $(NT - NG)/NT$ in the formula, on Page G-38], and
 - ° programs warranting adjustments because YECs are difficult to attain [this proportion is represented as NG/NT in the formula].
2. Determine a PTR and YEEN standard for youth in employability enhancement programs using the PY 89 worksheet [labeled "PO" in the formula]. The estimate of the PTR or YEEN is better if the worksheet is completed using, in this instance, the characteristics of only youth served in employability enhancement programs. However, if the MIS system cannot provide terminee characteristics for youth specific to various programs, the worksheet can be

completed using the characteristics of all youth terminees.

3. Determine a PTR or YEEN standard for youth in programs where favorable outcomes are hard to attain [and substitute it for "PG" in the formula].
4. Multiply the expected performance for each program component by the proportion of youth terminees the SDA plans to have participate in that component (from Step 1).
5. Sum the weighted expected performance levels for each program to obtain a PTR or YEEN standard for all terminees.

The difficulty of using this general method is in determining a reasonable performance level for terminees in the special program. The Governor could substantiate this anticipated performance level using the following sources: historical performance, experience of other States/SDAs with similar programs, etc. For example:

- ° The Governor may simply decide that the model-adjusted standard for an intensive YEC program should be reduced by 10 percentage points.

- ° An SDA initiating a long YEC program and not expecting any positive terminations during a start-up period may decide to adjust the PTR or YEEN downward by the proportion of participants it expects to carry over into the next program year. For example, if 10 percent of this program's participants are carried over into the following year, .90 multiplied by the PTR or YEEN provides the "PG" value to be substituted into the weighted average formula.

Example of PTR Adjusted for
a Long YEC Program

An SDA is planning a 15-month program that will have a lower positive termination rate than the usual employment competency program because no YEC attainments are expected during the initial 15 months, i.e., the start-up period. The Governor has decided to adjust the PTR by using the YEER model.

1. The SDA plans to enroll 150 of youth in the long YEC program. Most of these youth will be carried over into the next program year. However, about 30 ("NG") will terminate this year without completing training. Another 70 youth will participate in youth employment-oriented program, for which no adjustment is warranted. Thus, in this program year, the SDA anticipates

100 ("NT") terminations will be from the long program and 70% from the employment-directed program.

2. The PTR worksheet is used to calculate the positive termination rate ("PO") of the youth in the employment-oriented programs. The result is 80%. Although this PTR seems higher than the portion of participants who will be successfully placed, the Governor recognizes that Departmental policy discourages further adjustments.
3. Of those terminating from the long YEC program before completing the basic skills training, planners anticipate that 90% will be negative terminations and 10% will have found jobs for themselves. Thus the PTR for the start-up period of this program ("PG") is 10%.
4. (and 5). The Governor uses the following formula to calculate the positive termination rate for youth in both programs:

$$\left[\frac{(NT - NG)}{NT} \times (PO) \right] + \left[\frac{NG}{NT} \times (PG) \right] = PT$$

$$[.70 \times 80\%] + [.30 \times 10\%] = PT$$

$$56\% + 3\% = 59\%$$

The adjusted standard is 59% and the adjustment that can be entered on Line D of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" is $(PT - PO = 59\% - 80\%) = -21\%$.

The weighted average approach, thus, reduces the SDAs' overall standards by an amount depending on the proportion of youth in the long YEC program as illustrated in the example.

VII. ADJUSTING COST STANDARDS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH OTHER ADJUSTMENTS

A. Adjusting Cost Standards When Positive Termination and/or Entered Employment Rates Are Adjusted For a Target Group or a YEC Start-Up Period (PTR model)

When adjustments are made to model-derived adult entered employment and youth positive termination rates, the corresponding cost standards also need to be revised. This adjustment can be calculated by multiplying the original cost standards by the ratio of the original positive termination/entered employment rate to the revised rate for the SDA.

Example of an Adjustment to Cost to
Accommodate an Adjusted PTR or YEER

Suppose an SDA has a model-adjusted performance standard for the cost per positive termination of \$4,000. Its positive termination rate was adjusted from 80% to 65% because of the start-up of a long program. Its standard for the cost per positive termination would become \$4,923.

$$\$4000 \times (80\%/65\%) = \$4,923$$

The adjustment entered on Line E of the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" would be:

$$\$4,923 - \$4,000 = \$923$$

B. Adjusting Cost Standards for Intensive
Pilot Programs

The cost models do not adjust for unusually intensive kinds of training that may be short-term but involve legitimate high unit costs. SDAs that plan to provide such training are penalized with low "cost per" estimates because the only program adjustment is for percent of participants who are terminees in a particular program year. Serious consideration should be given to whether such a cost adjustment is warranted because many factors that might contribute to higher training costs are a result of management factors that have been purposely

omitted from the model. If a more generous cost standard is determined appropriate, use the weighted average approach described earlier on page G-35.

Example of Adjusted Cost Standard for an Intensive Pilot Program

The model-derived CPT is \$3700; the SDA plans on operating a pilot program for 50 teenage drug abusers estimated to cost \$5500 per terminée. A total of 400 youth terminees are served by the SDA.

$$\left[\frac{350}{400} \times 3700 \right] + \left[\frac{50}{400} \times 5500 \right] = PT$$
$$3237.50 + 687.50 = PT$$

$$\$3925 = PT$$

Thus, the adjusted cost standard is \$3925 and the adjustment entered in Line E on the worksheet for "Adjustments Beyond the Model" is \$3925 - \$3700 = \$225.

VIII. PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT ADJUSTMENT

Governors may wish to examine SDAs' past performance and set reasonable productivity improvement

factors for each measure. These factors may be added to the worksheet as an additional adjustment.

IX. IMPORTANCE OF NEGOTIATION IN ADJUSTMENT
PROCESS

States are encouraged to negotiate specific adjustments to model-adjusted performance levels with their SDAs. A committee of the State Job Training Coordinating Council should review requests for adjustments based on their merits and to establish policy precedents.

STATE
SHOULD
NEGOTIATE
ADJUSTMENTS
WITH SDA

State staff should develop formulas to quantify the problem and its relationship to performance, and to provide SDAs with acceptable sources of documentation. For example, the State MIS may provide useful performance estimates for a target group not included in the model.

A statewide SDA may also need to assess and document the effects of additional circumstances in different parts of the State. The approach to determining the effects of this situation on the overall Statewide SDA performance is similar to that suggested for multi-SDA States.

PART H

SETTING PERFORMANCE GOALS FOR SERVICE-PROVIDER CONTRACTS

PART H
SETTING PERFORMANCE GOALS FOR
SERVICE-PROVIDER CONTRACTS

Most SDA service-provider contracts include performance requirements to enable the SDA to meet one or more of its performance standards. An SDA has two options for determining the performance requirements for individual contractors. A simple approach of assigning the same performance criteria to all contractors is not recommended because it treats all service providers the same, regardless of whether they are serving hard-to-serve clients or those in need of more intensive services. A preferable approach is to vary the performance requirements of individual contractors to account for the type of participants and/or differences in services provided, while at the same time maintaining the overall performance standards for the SDA.

This section discusses how SDAs can vary performance requirements to account for differences in the type of clients they expect a service provider to serve or differences in program activity. Appropriately varying the terms of these contracts will allow service providers to serve the more hard-to-serve groups and to provide more intensive, longer-term training.

Service-provider contracts can take account of service to the hard-to-serve (or intensive program activities) by:

- ° Varying total expected costs of the service provider's contract according to the characteristics of the participants.

**VARYING
CONTRACT
TERMS FOR
SERVICE TO
DIFFERENT
GROUPS**

Costs may be greater for providers that serve a more difficult target group or provide more extensive services.

- ° Varying levels of expected performance on entered employments and positive terminations according to the characteristics of the participants. Providers serving the more disadvantaged should be given a lower goal.
- ° Providing incentives for achieving performance beyond placement and positive termination goals. The SDA may pay a bonus if a provider achieves a specified entered-employment rate. Alternatively, an SDA may pay more per entered employment after a specified portion of entered employments have been reached.

**LIMITATIONS
OF SDA
STANDARDS
AS SERVICE
PROVIDER
GOALS**

Previous sections of this technical assistance guide may assist the SDA in deciding how and by how much to vary performance requirements of contracts. The DOL model provides information about how to vary performance measures to account for participant characteristics at the SDA level. Part G of this technical assistance guide provides further information about how to adjust performance measures for variables not in the model, including program activity. The information in earlier sections falls short of providing SDAs with information for setting terms of service provider contracts for several reasons: (1) the DOL performance measures are often not directly

included among contract terms; (2) national standards or DOL model-predicted values for costs include SDA overhead as well as the cost of program contracts; (3) SDA standards do not (and perhaps, should not) reflect differences in program activities; and (4) DOL models work best at estimating overall SDA performance.

When applied to individual service-provider contracts, these adjustment models are less precise. This chapter provides appropriate methods for compensating for these limitations. Nonetheless, because DOL models lack precision at the service provider level, the results of these procedures should be used with discretion.

DOL performance measures, including their adjustments for participant characteristics and program activity, can be converted to variations in contract terms. Using four basic steps:

- ° Determine the adjustments to the DOL performance measures (e.g., entered employment rates, cost per entered employment) for participant characteristics and program activities of each service provider.
 - ° Determine the performance level around which these adjustments should be made for service providers.
 - ° Convert the variations in performance measures into variations in contract terms (e.g. performance goals, total expected contract cost).
- CONVERTING
VARIATIONS
IN
PERFORMANCE
GOALS TO
CONTRACT
TERMS

- ° Check that the service provider goals add up to goals at the SDA level, that is, are consistent with the SDA's own performance standards.

Each of these steps is discussed in detail below.

I. VARYING PERFORMANCE MEASURES AT THE SERVICE-PROVIDER LEVEL

DOL MODELS PROVIDE A STARTING POINT

The first step in varying service-provider goals is to make use of the information on how to vary DOL performance measures for participant characteristics and program activity. The DOL adjustment models provide a starting point.

Nearly all the DOL adjustment models are based on JASR data and relate an SDA's performance to the characteristics of all terminees from that SDA.

The DOL models may also be applied to the service provider level. This can be accomplished by completing the worksheets to determine the amount of adjustment, using the vendor's planned characteristics in Column G. The worksheets should be filled out through Box L, which indicates the total amount of adjustments.

The use of the DOL model, however, is only a first step. These models may not yield reasonable performance estimates in all cases, particularly in the following circumstances:

WHEN FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS ARE NEEDED

- ° If the program is targeted to groups not included in the model (e.g., substance abusers, Vietnam veterans, teenage mothers).

- ° If the program is narrowly targeted to specific segments of the SDA's clients, even if the characteristics are included in the model (e.g., 100% welfare recipients).
- ° If the program offers a program service where employment is not the immediate goal (e.g., basic skills training).
- ° If the program offers intensive services so that the length of training does not adequately adjust for the costs.

Under these circumstances, further adjustments should be considered for service providers.

Indeed, many of these adjustments may be much more appropriately applied to service providers' goals than to SDAs' standards. The following information may be used in making additional adjustments:

- ° Governor's adjustments. If the State has used any adjustments beyond the model in setting the SDA's standards, these same adjustments can be used in determining the vendors' goals. **INCLUDE
GOVERNOR'S
ADJUSTMENT**
- ° JTQS weights for characteristics not included in the model. Part G of this TAG provides weights for several additional terminee characteristics and program activity adjustments for the entered-employment rate, positive-termination rate and wage rate standards. These weights can also be used to adjust service providers' **CONSIDER
ADJUSTMENTS
BEYOND THE
MODEL**

goals. Unfortunately, the JTQS does not have any information about program costs or postprogram outcomes so these adjustments are not available for the cost-per-entered-employment, cost-per-positive-termination or follow-up standards. However, some of the other approaches described in Part G, such as the weighted average approach, may be useful for adjusting these cost measures.

° Adjustments for extreme service levels.

If service providers have extreme values on terminee characteristics, then the adjustments discussed in Part G can be used. When service levels are extreme on a number of factors, the model adjustments may become unreasonable (e.g., producing a very low or negative cost goal). Such terminee characteristics may be capped at the extreme values listed in the table on pages G-9 and G-10 to yield a more reasonable goal for the service provider. For example, an SDA may substitute the recommended extreme value of 30% in Column G of the worksheet for a provider serving 100% offenders.

CONSIDER
CAPPING
EXTREME
SERVICE
LEVELS

Expanded tolerance ranges. Whether or not extreme service levels have been capped, a wider tolerance range can be used, setting the goal at the more lenient end of the range. The expanded tolerance ranges are found on page G-12.

CONSIDER
EXPANDED
TOLERANCE
RANGE

- ° Past performance of similar providers. If REVIEW PAST
several vendors in the SDA are providing PERFORMANCE
similar services or if other SDAs will OF SIMILAR
share information on performance, the aver- SERVICES OR
age performance of similar providers can be TARGET
used to set service-provider goals. Public GROUPS
advocacy groups may also be able to provide
information about usual performance and
costs of serving special target groups.

If the SDA decides to make adjustments beyond the ADJUST FOR
model for providers serving the hard-to-serve, then EASY-TO-
the SDA should make comparable adjustments in the SERVE, TOO
opposite direction for providers serving easy-to-
serve individuals. In this way, the adjustments
made at the service provider level will be more
consistent with the SDA's own model-derived stand-
ards. Consider the following example:

Example of Adjusting Goals of Service
Providers Targeting the Hard- vs.
Easy-to-Serve

An SDA has one provider targeting teenage
mothers and other providers serving no special
target groups. The provider serving only
teenage mothers would receive an adjustment of
-5.9 to the Entered Employment Rate goal using
information provided from the JTQS data (page
G-23):

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SERVICE PROVIDER VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHT	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS... (I TIMES J)
% Female Teen Parent	100%	6.4%	93.6	-.064	-5.99

The adjustment for a provider serving no teenage mothers is +.4:

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SERVICE PROVIDER VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHT	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS... (I TIMES J)
% Female Teen Parent	0.0%	6.4%	-6.4	-.064	+.410

Spread across a much larger group, this seemingly small adjustment balances the larger adjustments for small target groups like teenage mothers.

Finally, if any adjustments were used for service provider goals that were not applied by the State to the SDA's expected performance, service provider goals may not add to the SDA's standard. The SDA could increase the level (i.e. departure point) of performance goals for service providers to compensate for adjustments not included in the SDA's own standard.

Example of Adjusting Service Provider Goals
for Program Activity When SDA's Standard
is Not Adjusted for It

The SDA's EER standard is set using the DOL model with no further adjustments. Based upon its planned service levels, the SDA's standard is 79%. The SDA is contracting with three service providers offering different adult program activities and service levels as follows:

Service Provider	Expected Number of Participants Served (i.e. Program Slots)	Model Derived EER	Planned Program Activity
A	100	80%	Job Search Assistance
B	100	78%	All Participants receive a combination of OJT and basic education.
C	100	74%	Basic Skills Only

Using the program activity adjustments from JTQS data provided in G-26, the EER goal for Provider A is 92 (80 + 12):

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SERVICE PROVIDER VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHT	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS... (I TIMES J)
% JSA	100%	22.9	77.1	.210	+16.2
% CT BASIC					
SKILLS	0%	9.6	- 9.6	-.183	+ 1.8
% CT OCC.					
SKILLS	0%	29.2	-29.2	.025	- .7
% OJT	0%	28.8	-28.8	.177	- 5.1
% WE	0%	4.3	- 4.3	.028	- .1
				Adjustment	+12.1

In calculating the program activity adjustment, JTPA participants receiving combinations of training activities are treated as the "reference" or excluded category. Thus, Service Provider B has zeroes in all 5 rows of Column G. Its adjustment is -8.9 for an EER of 69%.

Service Provider C, offering basic skills training only, enters 100% in the second row Column G and zeroes in the other rows.

Alternatively the service provider can enter 100% in the second row Column G and the adjustment weight given on G-26 for classroom training in basic education only in Column J and apply this result directly to the performance goal. The adjustment is - 27 for an EER of 47%.

The SDA calculates its own standard including an adjustment for program activity to be 71% (79 - 8):

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SERVICE PROVIDER VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS... (I TIMES J)
% JSA	33.3	22.9	10.4	.210	+ 2.2
% CT-BASIC SKILLS	33.3	9.6	23.7	-.183	- 4.3
% CT-OCC. SKILLS	0%	29.2	-29.2	.025	- .7
% OJT	0%	28.8	-28.8	.177	- 5.1
% WE	0%	4.3	- 4.3	.028	- 0.1
				Adjustment	- 8.0

II. SETTING THE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE GOALS FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS

The previous section presents methods to adjust performance measures to account for differences in terminée characteristics and program services. The question remains, however, around what level the adjustments should be made.

As discussed in Part E, the departure point specified in the worksheets represents a minimally acceptable level of performance. That is, the departure point for all measures except the average wage at placement and the welfare follow-up employment rate represents no more than the 25th percentile of performance. SDAs should not plan to meet only a minimally acceptable level but rather plan to achieve close to the national average level of performance. In this way, the SDAs will have leeway so that if unforeseen events adversely affect their performance, they can still meet their standards.

PLAN FOR AN
AVERAGE
LEVEL OF
PERFORMANCE

If SDAs plan to perform at the average level of performance, they will want to set goals for their service providers that are closer to average expected performance or better, rather than to minimally acceptable performance.

CONVERT
FROM A
MINIMALLY
ACCEPTABLE
TO A HIGHER
PERFORMANCE
LEVEL

To increase the level of performance expectations from minimally acceptable performance to a higher level of performance, the SDA should increase the departure point printed on the worksheets.

Attachment 5 indicates those values that should be added to the DOL departure point to obtain additional percentiles of performance. SDAs may also

wish to use these values to designate exemplary performance for granting incentives or to identify poor performance.

The SDA may wish to use different levels of performance expectations for different measures. For example, an SDA may set the typical service-provider performance goals for the entered employment rate and the cost-per-entered-employment at the average or higher level. On the other hand, poor local labor market conditions may warrant an SDA setting the wage rate departure point at a more minimally acceptable level (e.g., the DOL departure point representing the 40th percentile).

USE
PERCENTILES
TO SET
VARYING
LEVELS

In establishing cost goals for individual service providers, the SDA should also account for any other general costs (e.g., transportation, certification, administrative overhead, etc.). The cost-per-entered-employment measure represents an SDA's total costs, i.e., both the direct cost of providing services and other general costs. To determine the appropriate cost-per-entered-employment or cost-per-positive-termination goals for service providers, therefore, the SDA must back out any non-training related costs not specifically attributable to each contract.

SUBTRACT
GENERAL
COSTS FROM
PROVIDERS'
COST GOALS

Example of Subtracting General Overall Costs
from Provider's Cost Goals

An SDA's planned cost per entered employment goal is \$3,000, which provides for a productivity increase over the prior performance period.

If the SDA expects 500 entered employments, then the planned performance cost at the SDA level would be $\$3,000 \times 500$ or $\$1,500,000$. If the SDA's planned "general costs" are $\$300,000$, then the amount remaining to be spent at the service provider level would be $(\$1,500,000 - \$300,000) = \$1,200,000$. Dividing $\$1,200,000$ by 500 yields $\$2,400$ (i.e., 20% less than $\$3,000$) as the cost per entered employment at the service provider level. Thus, the SDA could use $\$2,400$ as a starting point in negotiations with service providers.

After the SDA has determined an average performance level (departure point) for its service providers, it should replace the value given in the DOL worksheets with the revised departure point. Using the worksheets the SDA can calculate adjustments for each service provider.

III. CONVERTING PERFORMANCE MEASURES TO CONTRACT TERMS

The following section does not describe all the procedures for arriving at contract costs or specifications. Factors such as cost reasonableness, previous contractor experience, other procurement requirements, and appropriate cost classification are not included. Keeping in mind these caveats, individual service provider contracts can be varied as to the number of enrollees, the type and extent of the services/training provided, the level of performance, and related costs in order to ensure that services are provided to different types of participants according to their needs.

A. Enrollment Specifications

If the SDA varies the performance expectations of individual service provider contracts to allow for differences in participant characteristics, then the SDA should consider what contract specifications will ensure that the target population was actually served, warranting the difference in performance requirements.

At a minimum, whether a provider actually served the types of clients that it had planned to serve could be considered in determining whether to renew the contract in the next program year.

REVIEW
PLANNED VS.
ACTUAL
SERVICE
LEVELS AT
END OF
CONTRACT

In addition, two types of contract specifications can be used to ensure that performance expectations match actual service levels.

- (1) The contract may include required enrollment specifications, limiting the number of participants that can be enrolled within each type of a given set of characteristics to planning estimates. Enrollment specifications may be most important where significant variations in services, costs, and/or performance have been built into the contract budget and goals to allow for special population groups.
- (2) The contract may provide performance requirements adjusted at year end to reflect the service levels actually

achieved. Recalculating the performance requirements for actual enrollment levels allows enrollment flexibility. In both of these cases, the DOL model could be used to establish the performance goals. Indeed, if goals are recalculated using actual service levels at the end of the contract, the model itself becomes incorporated in the contract.

B. Service and Training Specifications

If the SDA varies service provider contracts to allow for different mixes of activities and services, then the SDA should also include contract specifications to ensure that the contractor provides the agreed upon mix.

If, for example, a contractor is serving a much larger dropout population, the contract might provide for additional time in the program or supplemental remediation activities. Offender programs, on the other hand, might require more hours of intensive counseling. These differences may result in cost increases.

These additional services may result in longer periods of participation and higher program costs. They may also result in higher placements and, thus, offset any increase in the cost per entered employment.

Because the provision of additional services may not always relate to DOL model-based performance measures, contracts may specify more appropriate terms, e.g., contract hours, educational gains, particular competency measures. Additional services must be tied to costs if program expenses are not cost reimbursable.

C. Cost Specifications

The performance cost of the contract can be derived once an estimated entered employment rate and estimated cost per entered employment are negotiated with a service provider. (The number of individuals that are expected to enter employment is the entered employment rate for that service provider times the number of terminees.) The performance cost can be calculated by multiplying the cost per entered employment by the number that entered employment. If the SDA has varied the entered employment rate and the cost per entered employment by differences in participant characteristics and adjusted further for program activity, then the performance costs to a provider will reflect these differences.

PERFORMANCE
COSTS OF
CONTRACTS
MAY VARY

Finally, contracts can vary the distribution of payments across intermediate and final outcomes. For a given performance cost, payments can be distributed in a variety of ways. The relationship between the distribution of payments and performance measures is shown below.

DISTRIBU-
TION OF
PAYMENTS

For example, a contract might have two milestones for payment:

- ° Program completion, with a payment of P_C for each individual that completes the program.
- ° Entered employment, with a payment of P_e for each individual that enters employment.

The planned performance cost, TC , that the SDA will pay to the provider for the contract would be:

$$TC = P_C \times \text{Number of Program Completers} + P_e \times \text{Number of Entered Employments}$$

The cost per entered employment is:

$$\frac{TC}{EE} = \frac{(P_C \times C) + (P_e \times EE)}{EE}$$

where C is the Number of Program Completers, and EE is the Number of Entered Employments.

**EER AND CEE
PRODUCE A
VARIETY OF
PAYMENT
SCHEDULES**

This equation suggests that the amount of payments for the milestones in a contract is related to both the entered employment rate and the cost per entered employment. It indicates that a variety of payment schedules are consistent with a given entered employment rate and cost per entered employment. Thus, the SDA must make further decisions about what incentives they want service providers to face. The examples below will illustrate this point.

To calculate the expected performance cost of a contract, the SDA must also decide on the number of enrollees who are expected to reach each milestone. Thus, in this example, the SDA needs an estimate of the proportion of enrollees who will complete the program. This estimate may be based on the experience of the SDA or of other SDAs in their area.

NEED
ESTIMATE
OF PROGRAM
COMPLETERS

**Example 1: Distribution of Payments
for a Basic Skills Competency Attainment**

The SDA is contracting for basic skills training as part of a youth employment competency program for 100 youths, where the primary goal is to increase participants' reading skills. The program offers participants the incentive of placing them in jobs when they complete the training. Using the DOL model and further adjustments, the SDA concludes that a reasonable cost per positive termination is \$3,250 and a reasonable program completion rate (positive termination) is 80%, and entered employment rate is 60%. Two out of many possible payment schedules are proposed:

	Positive Termination (Completed Basic Skills Program (80%)	Entered Employment (60%)
Payment		
Schedule A	\$1,000	\$3,000
Payment		
Schedule B	\$2,500	\$1,000

Both schedules are consistent with the \$3,250 cost per positive termination. That is,

Schedule A: $\frac{TC}{PT} =$

$$\frac{[\$1000 \times (.80 \times 100)] + [\$3,000 \times (.60 \times 100)]}{.80 \times 100}$$

$$= \$3,250$$

Schedule B: $\frac{TC}{PT} =$

$$\frac{[\$2500 \times (.80 \times 100)] + [\$1000 \times (.60 \times 100)]}{.80 \times 100}$$

$$= \$3,250$$

Schedule A, however, provides more incentive to the vendor to place terminees in jobs. Schedule B provides the vendor with greater incentive to retain participants until they complete the program regardless of whether or not they are able to get them jobs when participants finish.

Example 2: Distribution of Payments for Occupational Skills

The SDA also funds an occupational skills program for 100 enrollees. The SDA has determined that an appropriate cost per entered employment for this program is \$2,500 and an appropriate entered employment rate is 70%. Two possible payment schedules are:

	Completion	Entered Employment
	<u>(60%)</u>	<u>(80%)</u>
Payment Schedule C	\$1000	\$1,200
Payment Schedule D	\$300	\$2,000

Again, both schedules have an expected cost per entered employment of \$2,000:

Schedule C: $\frac{TC}{EE} =$

$$\frac{[\$1000 \times (.80 \times 100)] + [\$1200 \times (.70 \times 100)]}{.70 \times 100}$$

$$= \$2,343$$

Schedule D: $\frac{TC}{EE} =$

$$\frac{[\$300 \times (.80 \times 100)] + [\$2000 \times (.70 \times 100)]}{.70 \times 100}$$

$$= \$2,343$$

Schedule D, however, provides considerably more incentive to place participants than does Schedule C and, thus is more consistent with the goals of this program.

These examples indicate that many payment schedules are consistent with specific cost per entered employment and entered employment goals.

**HOW TO
CHOOSE THE
DISTRIBUTION**

One approach that SDAs may use to determine an appropriate payment schedule is to choose the proportion of the performance payment, F , (i.e., the amount paid if a participant achieves all the milestones) that will be paid for each intermediate and final outcome. That is, if

$$F = P_C + P_E ;$$

$$r = P_C/F \text{ or the proportion of } F \text{ paid for} \\ \text{program completion; and}$$

$$s = P_E/F \text{ or the proportion of } F \text{ paid for} \\ \text{entered employments;}$$

the SDA could set r and s (Note: $r + s = 1$) and then solve for F and P_C and P_E .

Expressed in terms of the performance cost, F is:

$$F = \frac{TC}{(r \times C) + (s \times EE)}$$

Example of Setting the Payment Schedule
by Choosing the Proportion of the Performance
Payment Paid for Each Milestone

Suppose an SDA chooses to pay a provider serving youth .60 of the total payment for program completion, and .40 for an entered employment. The provider's performance goals are a cost per entered employment of \$4,000 and an entered employment

rate of 75%. A program completion rate of 80% is expected. Further, 100 enrollees are expected, all of whom will terminate during the program year.

The number of program completers is $.80 \times 100$ or 80; number of entered employments is $.75 \times 100$ or 75; and the total cost is $\$4,000 \times 75$ or $\$300,000$. The performance payment is therefore:

$$F = \frac{\$300,000}{(.60 \times 80) + (.40 \times 75)} = \$3,846$$

The appropriate payments, therefore, are:

$.60 \times 3846$ or $\$2,308$ for completion, and
 $.40 \times 3846$ or $\$1,538$ for placement.

Because the performance cost was calculated using the $\$4,000$ cost per entered employment, this payment schedule is consistent with that goal.

IV. CHECKING THAT THE SERVICE PROVIDER GOALS ADD UP TO THE SDA GOALS

After goals have been developed for service providers, the SDA should check that the aggregate of these service provider goals are consistent with the SDA's own planning goals.

The entered employment rate and the positive termination rate aggregations are the most straight

forward. The SDA's entered employment rate is simply the weighted average of the service providers' entered employment rates, with the number of terminees as the weights.

Example of Aggregating Service Provider EER Goals
to the SDA Goal

An SDA has two service providers, one with an EER goal of 60% and with 500 terminees expected and the other with an EER goal of 80% and 750 terminees expected. The SDA's expected EER is:

$$\frac{(.60 \times 500) + (.80 \times 750)}{500 + 750} = .72$$

The aggregation of the wage rate goals is also a weighted average of the service providers' goals, but in this case the weights are the number of terminees who enter employment. Thus, whether the SDA meets its wage rate goal depends both on whether service providers meet their wage rate goals, and on whether they meet their entered employment rate goals.

Example of Aggregating Service-Provider Goals
for Wage Rates to the SDA Goal

The SDA has two service providers, one with a wage rate goal of \$5.00 and the other with a wage rate goal of \$4.00, and both with 100 terminees and entered-employment rate goals of 75%. In this case the SDA's goal would be:

$$\frac{[\$5.00 \times (.75 \times 100)] + [\$4.00 \times (.75 \times 100)]}{(.75 \times 100) + (.75 \times 100)} = \$4.50$$

If, however, the service provider with the higher wage rate goal meets that goal but does not meet its entered-employment goal (e.g., achieves a 60% entered-employment rate instead), then the SDA would fall short of its wage rate goal. That is,

$$\frac{[\$5.00 \times (.60 \times 100)] + [\$4.00 \times (.75 \times 100)]}{(.60 \times 100) + (.75 \times 100)} = \$4.44$$

This example illustrates that the SDA should monitor service providers' performance on both wage rates and entered employments to assess the SDA's progress in meeting the wage rate standard.

When the DOL model is used to determine service provider goals, the sum of service provider adjustments will equal the adjustments made with the DOL model at the SDA level.

The cost per entered employment and the cost per positive termination rate are the ratios of two outcomes. These can also be calculated as a weighted average with the number of entered employments as the weights (or the number of positive terminations for the cost per positive termination measure).

Example of Aggregating Service Provider Cost Goals
to the SDA Goal

If one service provider expects 750 terminees and has an entered-employment rate of 80% and a cost-per-entered-employment goal of \$2,500 and the other provider expects 500 terminees and has an entered-employment rate of 60% and a cost-per-entered-employment goal of \$4,000, then the SDA's cost per entered employment is as follows:

$$\frac{(\$2500 \times 750 \times .80) + (\$4000 \times 500 \times .60)}{(750 \times .80) + (500 \times .60)} = \$3000$$

When the DOL model is used in determining the service-provider goals, the aggregate of service-provider adjustments will add up to the SDA's model-derived performance level. The aggregates of provider goals will not match the SDA standard, however, if:

- ° the same model was not used for both the SDA and provider goals/standards.
- ° Adjustments (e.g., tolerance ranges for extreme situations) were applied to either the SDA or provider goals and not to the other.
- ° The departure point of provider goals was changed from the minimally acceptable level to some harder to attain level. The SDA should check that the adjusted departure point (closer to average) is adequate to

offset any additional adjustments that lower aggregated service provider goals below the SDA standard.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter has indicated several steps that SDAs can follow to adjust contract terms for individual service providers to account for differences in participant characteristics and program services. These steps are:

- ° Determine adjustments to the DOL performance measures for service providers that account for differences in participant characteristics and program activity.
- Use DOL models as a way to obtain adjustments for participant characteristics.
- Make adjustments beyond the model to account for additional variables, based on Governor's adjustments, JTQS weights, adjustments for extreme service levels, or past performance of similar providers.
- Apply additional adjustments consistently to all service providers.
- ° Determine the average level of performance measures for service providers around which these adjustments should be made.

- Choose appropriate level of performance for each measure (e.g., 50th percentile of performance for entered employment rate, 40th percentile for wage rates).
 - Back out non-training related costs from cost measures.
 - Make service provider adjustments around revised departure point.
- ° Convert variations in performance measures into variations in the contract terms.
- Contracts may either specify the characteristics of enrollees or adjust performance expectations for them.
 - Performance costs for the contract can be calculated from the expected number of terminees and entered employment rates, and cost per entered employment rates that are adjusted for the characteristics of those the provider plans to serve.
 - For a given entered employment rate and cost per entered employment, payments can be distributed across payment milestones in a variety of ways. SDAs should choose payment schedules that are consistent with their program objectives.
- ° Check that service provider goals aggregate to levels consistent with the SDA's own performance goals.

- The entered employment rate is the weighted average of the service providers' entered employment rates, with the number of terminees as the weights.
- The wage rate and the cost per entered employment are also weighted averages of the providers' goals, with the number of entered employments as the weights.

APPENDIX A

Attachment 1

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE
JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS
FOR TITLES II-A AND III
FOR PY 1989

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE JTPA
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS
FOR TITLES II-A AND III
FOR PY 1989

The following provides general instructions for completing the JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets (PSW) including the sources of data and computation methods for the items on the worksheets.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORK-
SHEETS FOR ADULT, YOUTH, AND DISLOCATED WORKER PERFORMANCE
MEASURES

A. Service Delivery Area/Substate Area Name

Enter the Service Delivery Area/Substate Area name.

B. SDA/SSA Number

Enter the JTPA number assigned by the Governor to the SDA/SSA.

C. Performance Period

The performance period is preprinted.

D. Type of Standard/Date

Enter a check in the box next to the appropriate response (i.e., whether the standard is based on the SDA/SSA plan or is recalculated, based on actual service levels). Enter the date on which the calculations were made.

E. Performance Measure

The name of the appropriate performance measure for which the SDA/SSA Performance Standard is being established is preprinted.

F. Column F - Local Factors

The Local Factors determined by the Secretary to have a measurable influence on SDA/SSA expected performance levels for each of the performance measures are preprinted.

G. Column G - SDA/SSA Factor Values

Enter the SDA/SSA values for each Local Factor listed in "Column F." When the worksheets are used for planning purposes, these SDA/SSA Factor Values should reflect the characteristics of the participants expected to terminate during the program year. These planning values should be obtained from the SDA/SSA. When the worksheets are used to calculate final standards, actual terminee characteristics should be substituted for the planned SDA/SSA Factor Values.

The characteristics of the terminees must be expressed as a percent of the total number of participants who terminate during the program year (adult terminees for adult models, youth terminees for youth models and adult welfare recipients who terminate for the welfare model). SDA local economic data provided in Appendix B may be used to determine the SDA Factor Values for local economic conditions. Alternatively, more recent economic data obtained from the SESA or SDA/SSA may be used. NOTE: Currently, SSA configurations and local economic data are not available. If the SDA and SSA are identical, use the SDA local economic data.

H. Column H - National Averages

The national mean data for the Local Factors shown in "Column F" are preprinted. These represent the characteristics of JTPA terminees served in PY 86.

I. Column I - Difference

Subtract "Column H" (National Averages) from "Column G" (SDA/SSA Factor Values) for each Local Factor listed in "Column F" and enter the result in "Column I."

J. Column J - Weights

The appropriate Weight, "Column J," for each Local Factor listed in "Column F" is preprinted. These Weights indicate the estimated effect of each characteristic on the performance measure in question.

K. Column K - Effect of Local Factors on Performance Expectations
Multiply "Column I" by "Column J" for each Local Factor listed in "Column F," and enter the result in "Column K."

L. Block L - Total

Obtain the total of items listed in "Column K" by adding the positive items and subtracting the negative items. This represents the net effect of Local Factors on performance.

M. Block M - National Departure Point

The National Departure Point for each performance measure is preprinted for all measures except the optional Title III Average Wage at Placement.

NOTE: The departure point for the Title III Average Wage at Placement is to be determined by each Governor.

For Title III, the following departure points are offered:

25th Percentile	\$6.75
30th Percentile	\$6.83
35th Percentile	\$6.95
40th Percentile	\$7.08
50th Percentile	\$7.32

(The Adult Average Wage at Placement for II-A is set at the 40th percentile.)

N. Block N - Model-Adjusted Performance Level

Add the Total "Block L" to the National Departure Point "Block M." Enter the result in "Block N." This figure represents the Model-Adjusted Performance Level.

O. Block O - Governor's Adjustment

The Governor may adjust the Model-Adjusted Performance Level to account for additional circumstances, to include a productivity improvement factor, or to allow for statistical imprecision. To adjust for statistical imprecision, a number within the ranges listed may be added to, or subtracted from, the Model-Adjusted Performance Level ("Block N").

To allow for statistical imprecision of the adjustment model, an average tolerance range has been computed for each measure. The tolerance ranges for Title II-A, adult and youth measures, shown in column 2 of Tables I and II, respectively, are unchanged from PY 88. The tolerance ranges for Title III are shown in column 2 of Table III.

If the model-predicted performance level is extreme or two or more of the local factors are extreme, the Governor may consider applying a wider tolerance range adjustment to make the standard more lenient. Expanded tolerance ranges for Title II-A, adult and youth measures, appear in Column 3 of Tables I and II, respectively, and are unchanged from PY 88. Wider tolerance range adjustments are unavailable for Title III.

Table I
PY 89 Tolerance Range Adjustments
Title II-A Adult Measures

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>Tolerance Range</u>	<u>Optional Wider Tolerance Range for SDAs with Two or More Extreme Values</u>
Adults		
Entered employment rate	$\pm$ 3.5 percentage points	$\pm$ 4.6
Welfare entered employment rate	$\pm$ 3.8 percentage points	$\pm$ 4.7
Average wage at placement	$\pm$ \$0.17	$\pm$ \$0.22
Cost per entered employment	$\pm$ \$400	$\pm$ \$530
Follow-up employment rate	$\pm$ 4.2 percentage points	$\pm$ 5.4
Welfare follow-up employment rate	$\pm$ 5.1 percentage points	$\pm$ 6.4
Weeks worked in follow-up period	$\pm$ 0.5	$\pm$ 0.6
Weekly earnings of all employed at follow-up	$\pm$ \$14	$\pm$ \$18

Table II
PY 89 Tolerance Range Adjustments
Title II-A Youth Measures

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>Tolerance Range</u>	<u>Optional Wider Tolerance Range for SDAs with Two or More Extreme Values</u>
Entered employment rate	$\pm$ 4.3 percentage points	$\pm$ 5.6
Positive termination rate	$\pm$ 3.4 percentage points	$\pm$ 4.9
Employability enhancement rate	$\pm$ 5.6 percentage points	$\pm$ 6.5
Cost per positive termination	$\pm$ \$310	$\pm$ \$410

NOTE: Because variation among SDAs has decreased, and to allow for some sampling error in follow-up performance ranges, a larger confidence interval -- 99.9% -- has been used for the tolerance limits in PY 88/89 than was used for PY 86/87 (99%).

Table III
PY 89 Tolerance Range Adjustments
Title III Measures

<u>Performance Measure</u>	<u>Tolerance Range</u>
Adults	
Entered employment rate	± 3.4
Average wage at placement	± 0.38

NOTE: A confidence interval of 95.0% has been used for Title III
tolerance limits.

Although the adjustment models produce meaningful performance standards for a large majority of SDAs/SSAs, under some circumstances the results may be unacceptably extreme. Governors should examine individual performance expectations for SDAs/SSAs with extreme model-adjusted performance levels. The model-derived values which are considered extreme are given in Table IV, and extreme values of local factors for Adult, Youth and Welfare measures are provided in Tables V, VI, and VII. All extreme values are unchanged from PY 88.

Table IV
Extreme Model-Derived Performance Outcomes

<u>Adult Standards - II-A</u>	<u>Extreme Values</u>
Entered employment rate	< 55% > 80%
Welfare entered employment rate	< 44% > 66%
Cost per entered employment	<\$2,900 > \$6,100
Wage at placement	< \$3.77 > \$6.30
Follow-up employment rate	< 45% > 72%
Welfare follow-up employment rate	< 34% > 66%
Weeks worked in follow-up period	< 6.4 > 9.4
Weekly earnings of all employed at follow-up	< \$132 > \$225
<u>Youth Standards - II-A</u>	
Entered employment rate	< 16% > 72%
Positive termination rate	< 69% > 81%
Employability enhancement rate	< 11% > 49%
Cost per positive termination	<\$3,800 > \$5,900
<u>Title III</u>	
Entered employment rate	< 45% > 85%
Wage at placement	< \$5.00 > \$9.50

Table V
Extreme Values of Local Factors for Title II-A Adult Measures

<u>Local Factors</u>	<u>Extremely Low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	< 34	> 79
Percent 30 or More Years Old	< 38	> 68
Percent Black	-	> 85
Percent Hispanic	-	> 85
Percent Dropout	< 8	> 50
Percent Post High School Attendee	< 6	> 53
Percent UC Claimant	-	> 26
Percent Unemployed 15 or More Weeks	< 4	> 85
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 53
Percent AFDC Recipient	< 7	> 48
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 30
Percent of Participants That Terminated	< 45	-
Average Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Percent Families Below Poverty Level	< 3	> 26
Population Density ¹	-	N/A
Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	< 57	> 187
Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture	< 6	> 49
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	< -12	> 18

* Real earnings meaning inflation-adjusted earnings.

Table VI
Extreme Values of Local Factors for Title II-A Youth Measures

<u>Local Factors</u>	<u>Extremely Low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	< 33	> 70
Percent 14-15 Years Old	-	> 38
Percent 16-17 Years Old	< 4	> 61
Percent Black	-	> 93
Percent Hispanic	-	> 89
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	-	> 24
Percent Dropout	< 5	> 60
Percent Student	-	> 80
Percent Post High School Attendee	-	> 28
Percent Handicapped	-	> 59
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 84
Percent AFDC Recipient	< 4	> 50
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 22
Percent of Participants That Terminated	< 37	-
Average Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Percent Families Below Poverty Level	< 3	> 26
Population Density (1000 s/sq.m) ¹	-	N/A
Employee/Resident Worker Ratio	< 57	> 187
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	< -12	> 18

¹ Because population density is capped, there are no extreme values at the high end of the distribution.

More recent data (1986) were used to complete the population density factor.

* Real earnings meaning inflation-adjusted earnings.

Table VII
Extreme Values of Local Factors for Title II-A Welfare Measures

<u>Local Factors</u>	<u>Extremely Low</u>	<u>Extremely High</u>
Percent Female	< 40	-
Percent Black	-	> 96
Percent Dropout	< 9	> 59
Percent Unemployed 15 or More Weeks	< 5	> 94
Percent Not in Labor Force	-	> 77
Percent GA/RCA Recipient	-	> 59
Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)	< 9	> 18
Unemployment Rate	< 3	> 19
Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture	< 6	> 49
3-year Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade *	< -12	> 18

* Real earnings meaning inflation-adjusted earnings.

NOTE: Where local factors have extreme values at only the high/low end of the range, any value below/above this will be considered reasonable.

No extreme values have been developed for Title III as current data is insufficient for such an exercise.

Combine the adjustments allowed by the Governor and enter in "Block O" the total positive or negative adjustment. If no adjustment is determined to be appropriate, enter a zero in "Block O." Generally, the Governor's Adjustment applied at the beginning of the year for planning purposes should also be applied at the end of the year to determine actual standards.

However, additional adjustments may be made for circumstances that vary from the beginning to the end of the year due to unanticipated circumstances that occurred during the year.

P. Block P - SDA/SSA Performance Standard

Combine the Governor's Adjustment in "Block O" with the Model-Adjusted Performance Level in "Block N." Enter the result in "Block P."

NOTE: The user is reminded that National Averages and Weights (preprinted in Columns "H" and "J") and the National Departure Point in "Block M" should not be changed when calculating the expected performance level to preserve the integrity of the modeling approach. Further, all Local Factors must be included when computing the Model-Adjusted Performance Level.

ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE RANGES

Governors may wish to determine levels of exemplary or non-sanctionable performance using national levels of performance as a base. In this case, the numbers of a given measure at the percentile chosen by the Governor are added to or subtracted from the model-adjusted standard. The Governor may consider performance above that level either exemplary or non-sanctionable, depending upon the percentile used.

NOTE: The alternative percentile ranges in Tables VIII, IX, and X are unchanged from PY 88.

For Title III, substate incentive decisions use adjustments in Table VIII, Column 1 (EER) and Column 2 (AWP).

Table VIII
Alternative Performance Ranges
Adult Measures (Termination)

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>EER</u>	<u>Wage</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Welfare EER</u>
95%	+17.8	+.88	-2,980	+25.8
90%	+14.8	+.65	-2,670	+21.0
85%	+12.4	+.52	-2,420	+18.3
80%	+11.4	+.42	-2,280	+16.3
75%	+10.3	+.34	-2,170	+14.7
70%	+8.9	+.26	-2,050	+12.8
65%	+7.7	+.21	-1,930	+10.8
60%	+7.0	+.17	-1,780	+9.2
55%	+6.1	+.13	-1,700	+7.7
50%	+5.0	+.09	-1,600	+6.3
45%	+4.1	+.05	-1,520	+5.1
40%	+2.9	+.02	-1,400	+3.9
35%	+2.0	-.04	-1,290	+2.8
30%	+0.9	-.08	-1,160	+1.3
25%	0.0	-.12	-1,000	0
20%	-1.0	-.17	-870	-1.5
15%	-2.4	-.21	-690	-3.0
10%	-4.4	-.27	-410	-7.1
5%	-7.9	-.39	+140	-9.5

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

Table IX
Alternative Performance Ranges
Adult Measures (Follow-Up)

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>FER</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Earnings</u>	<u>Welfare FER</u>
95%	+18.8	+2.9	+51	+24.6
90%	+15.2	+2.3	+43	+20.9
85%	+13.9	+2.0	+36	+17.3
80%	+12.7	+1.8	+32	+15.9
75%	+11.3	+1.6	+28	+13.9
70%	+9.3	+1.3	+23	+12.4
65%	+8.3	+1.1	+20	+11.0
60%	+7.1	+1.0	+18	+9.2
55%	+6.4	+0.9	+16	+8.4
50%	+5.9	+0.8	+13	+6.8
45%	+5.0	+0.6	+9	+5.1
40%	+4.1	+0.5	+7	+3.9
35%	+3.1	-0.4	+4	+2.7
30%	+1.7	-0.2	+3	+1.3
25%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
20%	-1.2	-0.2	-3	-1.6
15%	-2.4	-0.5	-7	-3.8
10%	-5.0	-0.7	-15	-8.1
5%	-8.3	-1.3	-30	-12.0

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

Table X
Alternative Performance Ranges
Youth Measures

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>PTR</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>YEER</u>
95%	+17.9	-3,600	+26.6
90%	+15.8	-3,300	+22.7
85%	+14.2	-3,200	+19.9
80%	+12.8	-3,110	+18.0
75%	+11.3	-3,000	+15.3
70%	+10.3	-2,940	+13.5
65%	+ 9.3	-2,810	+12.2
60%	+ 8.5	-2,760	+10.5
55%	+ 7.4	-2,660	+ 8.8
50%	+ 6.5	-2,590	+ 7.2
45%	+ 5.4	-2,490	+ 6.2
40%	+ 4.5	-2,400	+ 5.0
35%	+ 3.3	-2,320	+ 3.5
30%	+ 2.5	-2,240	+ 1.9
25%	+ 1.5	-2,130	0
20%	- 0.1	-2,010	- 1.9
15%	- 2.2	-1,800	- 3.8
10%	- 5.2	-1,600	- 6.3
5%	-10.0	-1,130	-10.4

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORK-SHEET FOR WELFARE ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE AND WELFARE FOLLOW-UP EMPLOYMENT RATE

Two alternative methods are offered for adjusting the Welfare Entered Employment Rate and Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate. Governors may elect either method but must apply the same method for all SDAs in the State. Method I uses a worksheet similar to the other measures. For this method follow the general instructions using the characteristics of the **adult welfare recipients** instead of the characteristics of total adults in "Column G." Method II uses the ratio of the Welfare Employment Rate to the total Adult Employment Rate. The instructions for the ratio method appear below:

Using the Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate Ratio (Method II)

A. Blocks A through E

Complete according to the instructions provided for the JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets (PSW) for other measures.

B. Line 1 - Model-Adjusted Performance Level for the Adult Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate

Transfer the figure in "Block N" (Model-Adjusted Performance Level) from the completed PSW for the Adult Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate Measure.

C. Line 2 - State Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate Ratio

The State ratio of the Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate to the total Adult Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate is presented in Appendix A. Enter the appropriate ratio on "Line 2."

D. Line 3 - SDA Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate

Multiply the model-adjusted level for the Adult Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate, "Line 1," by the State Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate Ratio, "Line 2," and post the results on "Line 3."

E. Block (Line) N - Model-Adjusted Performance Level

Transfer the figure shown on "Line 3" above to "Block N."

F. Blocks (Lines) O through P

Complete according to the instructions for the JTPA Performance Standards Worksheets (PSW) for the other measures.

APPENDIX A

Attachment 2

SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS
FOR CALCULATING SELECTED ITEMS ON
THE JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS

SUPPLEMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR CALCULATING

SDA/SSA FACTOR VALUES ON PY 89

TITLE II-A AND TITLE III

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS

The following includes detailed instructions regarding data sources and computations for entries on the PY 89 Title II-A and Title III Performance Standards Worksheets (PSW) for Column G (SDA/SSA Factor Values).

Column G (SDA/SSA Factor Values) - Planning data sources to be used in computing the planned value for each local factor in the DOL model are described below. The local factors include terminnee characteristics, percent terminees and economic data. Data on terminnee characteristics and percent terminees should be obtained from each SDA/SSA.

Post the SDA/SSA planned values for each local factor in "Column G" of the appropriate PSW.

1. Terminnee Characteristics. In computing the SDA/SSA Factor Values, each terminnee characteristic (age, sex, race, educational status, etc.) is expressed as a percent of the total number of participants who will terminate during the program year (through June 30, 1990).

When using the worksheets for planning purposes, the SDA/SSA Factor Values should reflect the planned total number of terminations through June 30, 1990 for each characteristic as a percent of the planned total number of terminations from the program. When performance standards are recalculated at the end of the performance period, SDA/SSA Factor Values based on actual data through June 30, 1990 should be substituted for the planned SDA/SSA Factor Values.

If 6% participants are to be excluded for purposes of calculating PY 89 actual performance, then they should also be excluded from all calculations of terminnee characteristic factor values in Column G. See note at C1-1.

EXAMPLE: SDA #1 submits a plan that contains the following planned characteristics through June 30, 1990.

<u>ADULT</u> <u>TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>PLANNED</u> <u>ADULT TERMINATIONS</u>
Total	1,000
Male	501
Female	499
22 - 29 years	600
30 years and over	400
White	360
Black	390
Hispanic	200
Alaskan Native or American Indian	30
Asian or Pacific Islander	20
Student (High School or Less)	15
Dropout	335
High School Graduate (or Equivalent)	450
Post High School Attendee	200
Handicapped	95
Offender	60
UC Claimant	100
AFDC Recipient	300
GA/RCA Recipient	70
Unemployed 15 Weeks or More	375
Not in Labor Force	120

The SDA Factor Values that would be posted in "Column G" of the appropriate PSW for SDA #1 would be as follows:

<u>LOCAL FACTORS</u>	<u>COMPUTATION</u>	<u>SDA</u> <u>PLANNED VALUES</u>
% Female	$499 \div 1,000$	x 100 = 49.9
% Black	$390 \div 1,000$	x 100 = 39.0
% Hispanic	$200 \div 1,000$	x 100 = 20.0

% 30 years and over	400 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 40.0
% Post High School			
Attendee	200 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 20.0
% Dropout	335 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 33.5
% UC Claimant	100 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 10.0
% GA/RCA Recipient	70 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 7.0
% AFDC Recipient	300 ÷ 1,000	x	100 = 30.0

(The planner should carry out similar calculations using the SDA's planned values for each of the adult terminnee characteristics included as local factors in "Column F").

NOTE: If the Governor has elected to use the welfare model, the terminnee characteristics entered in Column G will not match those given above. The terminnee characteristics for this model will reflect the percent of adult welfare terminees with the specified characteristic.

<u>YOUTH</u>	<u>PLANNED</u>
<u>TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS</u>	<u>YOUTH TERMINATIONS</u>
Total	2,000
Male	1,001
Female	999
14 - 15 year old	700
16 - 17 year old	600
18 - 21 year old	700
White	472
Black	824
Hispanic	602
American Indian or Alaskan Native	60
Asian or Pacific Islander	42
Student (High School or Less)	900
Dropout	500
Post High School Attendee	250
Handicapped	100
AFDC Recipient	700
GA/RCA Recipient	50
Not in Labor Force	800

The SDA Factor Values that would be posted in "Column G" of the appropriate PSW for SDA #1 would be as follows:

<u>LOCAL FACTORS</u>	<u>COMPUTATION</u>	<u>SDA</u>	
		<u>PLANNED VALUES</u>	
% Female	$999 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 50.0$
% 14-15 year old	$700 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 35.0$
% Black	$824 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 41.2$
% Hispanic	$602 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 30.1$
% American Indian or Alaskan Native	$60 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 3.0$
% Dropout	$500 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 25.0$
% Student	$900 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 45.0$
% Post High School Attendee	$250 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 12.5$
% Handicapped	$100 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 5.0$
% AFDC Recipient	$700 \div 2,000$	x	$100 = 35.0$

(The planner should carry out similar calculations using the SDA's planned values for each of the youth terminnee characteristics included as local factors in "Column F".)

2. Percent Terminees (Adult/Youth/Dislocated Worker).

SDA/SSAs should provide to the Governor the planned and actual percent of participants who terminate during the program year. This number reflects the number of terminees during the program year divided by the number of participants (both new participants and participants carried into the program year).

3. Local Economic Conditions. The remaining local factors reflect the economic conditions within the SDA, not the labor market conditions of the individuals being served (i.e., adult vs youth unemployment rates). The specific economic factors are:

- Unemployment Rate
- Population Density (expressed in thousands per square mile and not to exceed 7)
- Percent of Families With Income Below the Poverty Level
- Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (expressed in thousands)
- 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade
- Employee/Resident Worker Ratio
- Percent of Employment in Manufacturing, Mining, and Agriculture

The Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade is calculated using the same source data that was used to compute average wages in the local area in previous years. This factor represents the annual average payroll per employee in the retail and wholesale trade industry (i.e., the total annual wages divided by the number of employees). The ES 202 data are published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) based upon employer information on their full and part-time employees covered by Federal and State unemployment insurance. Employees who are excluded from these employers' reports include: the majority of agricultural workers, members of the Armed Forces, railroad employees, domestics, self-employed individuals, and some employees of small, non-profit organizations.

The unemployment rate is the BLS estimate of the average unemployment rate for all individuals in the area. This rate is used in both the adult and youth models because separate unemployment rates by age are not consistently available for substate areas. Areas that have separate unemployment rates by age should not use separate rates as SDA factor values because the national average values and the weights are based on the overall average unemployment rate.

Population density is based upon the 1986 Bureau of the Census data for each county and city within the SDA divided by the land area (in square miles) within each county and city. The worksheet entry for population density is expressed in thousands per square mile and capped at 7. Although the actual population density for the SDA may be greater than seven thousand per square mile, the entry should not exceed 7. The Bureau of the Census publishes updated population estimates by city and county which, if available, can be substituted for the data in Appendix B.

The percent of families with income below the poverty level is obtained from the Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, and based upon 1979 reported income data. The poverty level is defined as \$7356 for a family of four with two children.

The employee/resident worker ratio is also obtained from the Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book. The ratio represents the number of persons working in a county and city divided by the number of workers residing in the county and city in 1980.

The PY 89 models contain two new local economic factors: the 3-year growth rate in real (i.e., inflation adjusted) annual earnings in retail and wholesale

trade, and the percent of employment in manufacturing, mining, and agriculture. These factors are intended to characterize the local economies in more dynamic terms than the other local economic factors included in the models.

The 3-year growth rate in real annual earnings in retail and wholesale trade measures the extent to which incomes have increased in the local area over the last 3 years (CY 1984 to CY 1987). Areas with healthy economies generally experience greater growth in earnings than areas experiencing economic stagnation. This factor is calculated using the ES 202 data on average earnings in retail and wholesale trade in the counties served by the SDA and the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI). It was calculated by first dividing average annual earnings in 1987 by earnings in 1984. This ratio was adjusted for inflation by multiplying by .915 (the ratio of the 1984 CPI (103.9) to the 1987 CPI (113.6)). The result was then converted to a percentage change by subtracting one and multiplying by 100.

The percent of employment in manufacturing, mining and agriculture (including fisheries and forestry) measures the extent to which the local economy is dependent on three broad industry groups that have recently experienced economic difficulties. It is based on the CY 1987 ES 202 data for the counties served by the SDA.

Any States which change their SDA configurations (or do not use existing SDA configurations for Title III substate areas) for PY 89 should contact Gail Borchers at (202) 535-0687 to obtain recomputed local economic factors.

In calculating the values of these economic conditions for SDAs, data on counties only were used to calculate the average earnings

in retail and wholesale trade and average wages in the local area. Data on cities and counties were used to calculate the employee/resident worker ratio. Data on cities, counties and townships in New England were used to calculate the remaining factors: unemployment rate, population density, and the percent of families with income below the poverty level. Values calculated in this manner were used to estimate the weights for the PY 89 models.

When a county is split between two SDAs—one serving an urban area and the other serving a rural area--or when parts of several counties are incorporated into a single SDA, city/suburb differences in labor market conditions can occur. Wage distribution in an SDA may become skewed due to a small proportion of very high paying jobs in a specific area. In such circumstances, a State may prefer using metropolitan-wide wage, unemployment, population density and poverty income data in adjusting performance standards for SDAs located in the metropolitan area.

As more recent data on area wage and unemployment rates become available from the State Employment Security Agency (SESA) or SDA, these data should be substituted for the information in Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

Attachment 3

JTPA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS FOR PY 89
TITLES II-A AND III

NOTE: PY Worksheets may be used for Title II-A as indicated in
TEIN NO. 19-88, dated February 3, 1989.

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard [] Plan [] Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Entered Employment Rate (Adult)		

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		55.1		-.077	
2. % Age 30 and Above		52.8		-.100	
3. % Black		23.2		-.047	
4. % Dropout		24.8		-.204	
5. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		48.7		-.062	
6. % Not In Labor Force		11.9		-.116	
7. % AFDC Recipient		23.8		-.124	
8. % GA/RCA Recipient		5.2		-.207	
9. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-.597	
10. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		-.406	
11. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.110	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated _____	E. Performance Measure Cost Per Entered Employment (Adult)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Post High School Attendee		24.0		- 6.9	
2. % Hispanic		8.3		6.0	
3. % UC Claimant		10.3		31.5	
4. % Not in Labor Force		11.9		5.9	
5. % AFDC Recipient		23.8		20.7	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		5.2		8.2	
7. % Terminees		73.2		- 20.6	
8. Unemployment Rate		7.4		62.0	
9. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		116.3	
10. Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)		0.7		46.6	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard () Plan () Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Average Wage at Placement (Adult)		

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		55.1		-.0078	
2. % Age 30 and Above		52.8		.0041	
3. % Black		23.2		-.0058	
4. % Dropout		24.8		-.0145	
5. % UC Claimant		10.3		.0210	
6. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		48.7		-.0011	
7. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		.0788	
8. Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)		0.7		.0776	
9. Employee/Resident Worker Ratio		99.9		-.0044	
10. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		-.0245	
11. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.0407	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					\$4.95
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated _____	E. Performance Measure Entered Employment Rate (Youth)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % 14-15 years old		5.7		-.563	
2. % Black		27.9		-.065	
3. % Dropout		25.2		-.292	
4. % Student		39.6		-.407	
5. % Handicapped		15.9		-.036	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		3.3		-.203	
7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-1.299	
8. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		-.113	
9. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.117	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					45.0
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard () Plan () Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Positive Termination Rate (Youth)		
F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Black		27.9		-.045	
2. % Hispanic		9.5		-.060	
3. % Asian/Pacific Islander		2.0		-.122	
4. % Student		39.6		.027	
5. % Post-High School Attendee		6.7		.202	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		3.3		-.116	
7. Population Density (1000s/sq.m)		.7		1.353	
8. Employee/Resident Worker Ratio		99.9		-.051	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT			75.0		
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period py 89	D. Type of Standard [] Plan [] Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Employability Enhancement Rate (Youth)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. & Female		50.6		.045	
2. & 14-15 years old		5.7		.186	
3. & 16-17 years old		32.4		.132	
4. & Dropout		25.2		.116	
5. & Student		39.6		.152	
6. & Handicapped		15.9		-.032	
7. & Not In Labor Force		38.7		.139	
8. & AFDC Recipient		20.4		-.085	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					
					30.0

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard [] Plan [] Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Cost Per Positive Termination (Youth)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % 14-15 years old		5.7		- 9.5	
2. % Hispanic		9.5		9.0	
3. % Student		39.6		- 11.7	
4. % Handicapped		15.9		8.4	
5. % Not In Labor Force		38.7		4.2	
6. % AFDC Recipient		20.4		15.1	
7. % Terminees		75.9		- 18.5	
8. Average Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		64.3	
L. Total					\$4,900
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard [] Plan [] Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Follow-Up Employment Rate (Adult)		

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Age 30 and Above		52.8		- .094	
2. % Black		23.2		- .105	
3. % Dropout		24.8		- .154	
4. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		48.7		- .052	
5. % Not In Labor Force		11.9		- .049	
6. % AFDC Recipient		23.8		- .103	
7. % GA/RCA Recipient		5.2		- .174	
8. Unemployment Rate		7.4		- .857	
9. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		- .461	
10. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.136	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					60.0
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard () Plan () Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Follow-up Weekly Earnings (Adult)		

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		55.1		- .712	
2. % Age 30 and Above		52.8		.077	
3. % Black		23.2		- .179	
4. % Dropout		24.8		- .447	
5. % UC Claimant		10.3		.720	
6. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		48.7		- .169	
7. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		2.553	
8. Population Density (1000s/sq.m.)		0.7		3.065	
9. Employee/Resident Worker Ratio		99.9		- .175	
10. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		-1.141	
11. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		1.455	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					\$177
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number																																																																																																
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Follow-Up Weeks Worked (Adult)																																																																																																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>F. LOCAL FACTORS</th> <th>G. SDA FACTOR VALUES</th> <th>H. NATIONAL AVERAGES</th> <th>I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)</th> <th>J. WEIGHTS</th> <th>K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTOR ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. % Black</td> <td></td> <td>23.2</td> <td></td> <td>-.013</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. % Dropout</td> <td></td> <td>24.8</td> <td></td> <td>-.008</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. % Unemployed 15 or More Weeks</td> <td></td> <td>48.7</td> <td></td> <td>-.009</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. % Not in Labor Force</td> <td></td> <td>11.9</td> <td></td> <td>-.011</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. % AFDC Recipient</td> <td></td> <td>23.8</td> <td></td> <td>-.017</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. % GA/RCA Recipient</td> <td></td> <td>5.2</td> <td></td> <td>-.034</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Unemployment Rate</td> <td></td> <td>7.4</td> <td></td> <td>-.110</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>8. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)</td> <td></td> <td>12.5</td> <td></td> <td>-.085</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>9. Employment in Manufacturing Mining and Agriculture</td> <td></td> <td>23.5</td> <td></td> <td>-.015</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>10. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade</td> <td></td> <td>0.2</td> <td></td> <td>.013</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">L. Total</td> <td colspan="3">8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">O. Governor's Adjustment</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">P. SDA Performance Standard</td> <td colspan="3"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTOR ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)	1. % Black		23.2		-.013		2. % Dropout		24.8		-.008		3. % Unemployed 15 or More Weeks		48.7		-.009		4. % Not in Labor Force		11.9		-.011		5. % AFDC Recipient		23.8		-.017		6. % GA/RCA Recipient		5.2		-.034		7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-.110		8. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		-.085		9. Employment in Manufacturing Mining and Agriculture		23.5		-.015		10. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.013		L. Total			8.0			M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT						N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)						O. Governor's Adjustment						P. SDA Performance Standard					
F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTOR ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)																																																																																																
1. % Black		23.2		-.013																																																																																																	
2. % Dropout		24.8		-.008																																																																																																	
3. % Unemployed 15 or More Weeks		48.7		-.009																																																																																																	
4. % Not in Labor Force		11.9		-.011																																																																																																	
5. % AFDC Recipient		23.8		-.017																																																																																																	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		5.2		-.034																																																																																																	
7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-.110																																																																																																	
8. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		-.085																																																																																																	
9. Employment in Manufacturing Mining and Agriculture		23.5		-.015																																																																																																	
10. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.013																																																																																																	
L. Total			8.0																																																																																																		
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT																																																																																																					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)																																																																																																					
O. Governor's Adjustment																																																																																																					
P. SDA Performance Standard																																																																																																					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet				A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Welfare Entered Employment Rate (Adult) (Method I)		

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTOR ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		77.1		- .210	
2. % Black		32.2		- .033	
3. % Dropout		29.9		- .200	
4. % Unemployed 15 or More Weeks		54.8		- .087	
5. % Not In Labor Force		19.0		- .166	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		13.9		- .209	
7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		- .787	
8. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		- .213	
9. Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture		23.5		- .127	
10. 3 yr. Growth Rate in Real Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade		0.2		.132	
L. Total					56.0
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Follow-Up Welfare Employment Rate (Adult) (Method I)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SDA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTOR ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		77.1		- .131	
2. % Black		32.2		- .106	
3. % Dropout		29.9		- .063	
4. % Unemployed 15 or More Weeks		54.8		- .099	
5. % Not In Labor Force		19.0		- .168	
6. % GA/RCA Recipient		13.9		- .127	
7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-1.270	
8. Annual Earnings in Retail and Wholesale Trade (000)		12.5		- .479	
9. Employment in Manufacturing, Mining and Agriculture		23.5		- .110	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					50.0
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SDA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Service Delivery Area's Name	B. SDA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard ☐ Plan ☐ Recalculated	Date Calculated _____	E. Performance Measure Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate (Adult) (Method II--Using the Ratio)	

1. Model-Adjusted Performance Level for the Adult Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate

2. State Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate Ratio

3. Welfare Follow-up/Entered Employment Rate

- N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level

- O. Governor's Adjustment

- P. SDA Performance Standard

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Substate Area's Name	B. SSA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard [] Plan [] Recalculated	Date Calculated _____	E. Performance Measure Entered Employment Rate (Title III)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SSA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		35.4		- .013	
2. % Age 55 or Older		7.6		- .059	
3. % All Minority		27.5		- .071	
4. % Dropout		16.8		- .030	
5. % Handicapped		2.6		- .067	
6. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		38.1		- .077	
7. Unemployment Rate		7.4		-1.300	
8. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		- .553	
L. Total					
M. NATIONAL DEPARTURE POINT					
64.0					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SSA Performance Standard					

PY 89 JTPA Performance Standards Worksheet			A. Substate Area's Name	B. SSA Number
C. Performance Period PY 89	D. Type of Standard () Plan () Recalculated	Date Calculated	E. Performance Measure Average Wage at Placement (Title III)	

F. LOCAL FACTORS	G. SSA FACTOR VALUES	H. NATIONAL AVERAGES	I. DIFFERENCE (G MINUS H)	J. WEIGHTS	K. EFFECT OF LOCAL FACTORS ON PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS, (I TIMES J)
1. % Female		35.4		-.0059	
2. % Age 55 or Older		7.6		-.0031	
3. % Post High School Attendee		28.6		.0076	
4. % All Minority		27.5		-.0074	
5. % Handicapped		2.6		-.0058	
6. % UC Claimant		54.1		-.0058	
7. % Unemployed 15 Weeks or More		38.1		-.0030	
8. % Families Below Poverty Level		9.7		-.0691	
9. Previous Wage		9.0		.4647	
L. Total					
M. DEPARTURE POINT					
N. Model-Adjusted Performance Level (L + M)					
O. Governor's Adjustment					
P. SSA Performance Standard					

(1-03-89)

APPENDIX A

Attachment 4

SDAs EXCLUDED FROM MODEL DEVELOPMENT
BECAUSE OF EXTREME CIRCUMSTANCES

(PY 89 Models)
SDAs Excluded from Model Development
Because of Extreme Circumstances

Adult Models

Anchorage/Matanuska-Susitna Consortium, Alaska
Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska
Balance of Alaska Consortium, Alaska
Cochise, Arizona
Navajo Nation, Arizona
Tribal Consortium, Arizona
Long Beach City in Los Angeles County, California
Yolo County, California
District of Columbia
Honolulu City/County, Hawaii
Hawaii County, Hawaii
Maui/Kalawao Consortium, Hawaii
Kauai County, Hawaii
Eastern KY CEP SDA (Area G), Kentucky
Navajo Nation, New Mexico
Yonkers City in Westchester County, New York
Southeast Utah Association of Governments, Utah
Alexandria/Arlington Consortium, Virginia

Welfare Models

Anchorage/Matanuska-Susitna Consortium, Alaska
Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska
Balance of Alaska Consortium, Alaska
Navajo Nation, Arizona
Tribal Consortium, Arizona
Honolulu City/County, Hawaii
Hawaii County, Hawaii
Maui/Kalawao Consortium, Hawaii
Kauai County, Hawaii
Navajo Nation, New Mexico
Yonkers City in Westchester County, New York
Alexandria/Arlington Consortium, Virginia

Youth Models

Anchorage/Matanuska-Susitna Consortium, Alaska
Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska
Balance of Alaska Consortium, Alaska
Coconino County, Arizona
Navajo Nation, Arizona
Tribal Consortium, Arizona
Monterey County, California
Yolo County, California
District of Columbia
Honolulu City/County, Hawaii
Hawaii County, Hawaii
Maui/Kalawao Consortium, Hawaii
Kauai County, Hawaii
SDA 23 PIC for SDA 23, Illinois
Greater Pontiac Consortium, Michigan
Minneapolis City in Hennepin County, Minnesota
Navajo Nation, New Mexico
Lumber River Job Training Consortium, North Carolina
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania
Luzerne/Schuylkill, Pennsylvania

Adult Follow-up Models

Little Rock City in Pulaski County, Arkansas
Imperial County, California
Herkimer/Madison/Oneida Consortium, New York
Southeast Utah Association of Governments, Utah

Welfare Follow-up Model

Louisiana Planning District 8 Consortium, Louisiana

APPENDIX A

Attachment 5

ALTERNATIVE RANGES OF PERFORMANCE

Governors may wish to determine levels of exemplary or non-sanctionable performance using national levels of performance as a base. In this case, the numbers of a given measure at the percentile chosen by the Governor are added or subtracted from the model-adjusted standard. The Governor may consider performance above that level either exemplary or non-sanctionable, depending upon the percentile used.

NOTE: The alternative percentile ranges are unchanged from PY 88

Alternative Performance Ranges
Adult Measures (Termination)

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>EER</u>	<u>Wage</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Welfare EER</u>
95%	+17.8	+.88	-2,980	+25.8
90%	+14.8	+.65	-2,670	+21.0
85%	+12.4	+.52	-2,420	+18.3
80%	+11.4	+.42	-2,280	+16.3
75%	+10.3	+.34	-2,170	+14.7
70%	+8.9	+.26	-2,050	+12.8
65%	+7.7	+.21	-1,930	+10.8
60%	+7.0	+.17	-1,780	+9.2
55%	+6.1	+.13	-1,700	+7.7
50%	+5.0	+.09	-1,600	+6.3
45%	+4.1	+.05	-1,520	+5.1
40%	+2.9	+.02	-1,400	+3.9
35%	+2.0	-.04	-1,290	+2.8
30%	+0.9	-.08	-1,160	+1.3
25%	0.0	-.12	-1,000	0
20%	-1.0	-.17	-870	-1.5
15%	-2.4	-.21	-690	-3.0
10%	-4.4	-.27	-410	-7.1
5%	-7.9	-.39	+140	-9.5

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

Alternative Performance Ranges
Adult Measures (Follow-Up)

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>FER</u>	<u>Weeks</u>	<u>Earnings</u>	<u>Welfare FER</u>
95%	+18.8	+2.9	+51	+24.6
90%	+15.2	+2.3	+43	+20.9
85%	+13.9	+2.0	+36	+17.3
80%	+12.7	+1.8	+32	+15.9
75%	+11.3	+1.6	+28	+13.9
70%	+9.3	+1.3	+23	+12.4
65%	+8.3	+1.1	+20	+11.0
60%	+7.1	+1.0	+18	+9.2
55%	+6.4	+0.9	+16	+8.4
50%	+5.9	+0.8	+13	+6.8
45%	+5.0	+0.6	+9	+5.1
40%	+4.1	+0.5	+7	+3.9
35%	+3.1	-0.4	+4	+2.7
30%	+1.7	-0.2	+3	+1.3
25%	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
20%	-1.2	-0.2	-3	-1.8
15%	-2.4	-0.5	-7	-3.8
10%	-5.0	-0.7	-15	-8.1
5%	-8.3	-1.3	-30	-12.0

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

Alternative Performance Ranges
Youth Measures

<u>Percentile</u>	<u>PTR</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>YEER</u>
95%	+17.9	-3,600	+26.6
90%	+15.8	-3,300	+22.7
85%	+14.2	-3,200	+19.9
80%	+12.8	-3,110	+18.0
75%	+11.3	-3,000	+15.3
70%	+10.3	-2,940	+13.5
65%	+ 9.3	-2,810	+12.2
60%	+ 8.5	-2,760	+10.5
55%	+ 7.4	-2,660	+ 8.8
50%	+ 6.5	-2,590	+ 7.2
45%	+ 5.4	-2,490	+ 6.2
40%	+ 4.5	-2,400	+ 5.0
35%	+ 3.3	-2,320	+ 3.5
30%	+ 2.5	-2,240	+ 1.9
25%	+ 1.5	-2,130	0
20%	- 0.1	-2,010	- 1.9
15%	- 2.2	-1,800	- 3.8
10%	- 5.2	-1,600	- 6.3
5%	-10.0	-1,130	-10.4

Note: To obtain the desired percentile of performance, add or subtract the value in the table to the model-derived performance level.

APPENDIX B

Attachment 1

STATE/SDA ECONOMIC DATA

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
1	CONNECTICUT	18.0	15.8	24.3	3.1	0.65	6.2	99.2
09005	BRIDGEPORT/ANSONIA/NORWALK/STAMFORD CONSORTIUM	20.6	14.5	28.0	3.0	1.60	6.2	101.4
09010	BRISTOL/NEW BRITAIN CONSORTIUM	18.3	16.3	22.0	3.4	1.34	5.3	114.9
09015	DANBURY/TORRINGTON CONSORTIUM	19.9	14.7	28.6	3.0	0.35	3.9	97.6
09020	DANIELSON/WINDHAM CONSORTIUM	12.3	13.1	34.3	3.5	0.23	8.0	83.6
09025	HARTFORD CONSORTIUM	17.9	16.2	21.6	2.8	0.79	7.0	107.7
09030	MERIDEN/MIDDLETOWN CONSORTIUM	14.3	18.7	27.0	2.8	0.48	6.0	85.3
09035	NEW HAVEN CONSORTIUM	16.3	17.5	21.4	3.0	1.43	8.7	94.3
09040	NORWICH/NEW LONDON CONSORTIUM	13.2	10.3	31.7	3.3	0.55	7.0	101.1
09045	WATERBURY CONSORTIUM	16.3	17.5	21.4	3.8	0.88	7.9	94.3

REGION STATE

SDA NUMBER & NAME

1 MAINE

23005 CUMBERLAND COUNTY

23020 PENOBSCOT CONSORTIUM

23025 12 COUNTY SDA

AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
12.5	6.5	24.0	4.2	0.04	9.8	98.8
14.7	9.3	13.9	2.3	0.26	7.5	109.8
11.9	3.7	22.1	4.5	0.02	10.0	102.6
11.3	5.0	29.4	4.7	0.04	10.4	94.1

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO -----
1 MASSACHUSETTS	16.8	16.3	23.0	2.9	0.75	7.6	100.8
25005 BOSTON CITY	18.4	8.1	7.0	3.0	7.00	16.7	173.6
25010 NEW BEDFORD/CAPE COD ISLANDS CONSORTIUM	12.9	15.3	25.5	4.0	0.54	9.9	93.3
25015 HAMPDEN CONSORTIUM	13.6	11.8	23.2	3.1	1.20	10.3	100.8
25020 NORTHERN WORCESTER CONSORTIUM	14.4	16.5	26.6	3.2	0.41	7.9	95.1
25025 SOUTHERN WORCESTER CONSORTIUM	14.4	16.5	26.6	3.0	0.61	7.8	95.1
25030 METRO NORTH CONSORTIUM	19.0	19.8	25.9	2.5	5.09	6.7	97.7
25035 BROCKTON AREA CONSORTIUM	13.9	16.7	16.0	3.3	1.32	8.1	70.9
25040 BRISTOL CONSORTIUM	13.0	12.3	32.9	4.2	0.81	8.2	92.3
25045 NORTHERN MIDDLESEX CONSORTIUM	19.0	19.8	25.9	3.1	1.56	7.0	97.7
25050 BERKSHIRE CONSORTIUM (BERKSHIRE COUNTY)	12.2	3.7	26.1	3.8	0.39	8.8	99.9
25055 LOWER MERRIMACK VALLEY CONSORTIUM	14.5	14.1	28.8	3.8	1.03	9.3	89.9
25060 SOUTHERN ESSEX NORTH SHORE EMPL. TRG. CONSORTIUM	14.5	14.1	28.8	3.1	1.63	7.1	89.9
25065 SOUTH COASTAL CONSORTIUM	17.2	17.0	17.2	2.7	0.93	5.2	78.9
25070 METRO SOUTHWEST CONSORTIUM	19.0	19.2	23.7	2.2	1.17	3.4	93.4
25075 FRANKLIN/HAMPSHIRE CONSORTIUM	11.6	12.4	17.6	2.8	0.41	7.6	86.1

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
1	NEW HAMPSHIRE	13.9	15.9	24.7	2.5	0.11	6.1	94.0
33005	NEW HAMPSHIRE CONSORTIUM	13.3	17.4	22.1	2.5	0.09	6.4	91.2
33010	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	15.1	13.4	29.5	2.4	0.36	5.5	100.3

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
1 RHODE ISLAND	14.0	7.5	27.7	3.6	0.93	7.8	98.5
44005 PROVIDENCE/CRANSTON CONSORTIUM	14.7	7.1	28.0	3.7	4.68	12.1	110.2
44010 NORTHERN RHODE ISLAND CONSORTIUM	14.7	7.1	28.0	3.9	1.29	8.2	110.2
44015 BALANCE OF RHODE ISLAND CONSORTIUM	12.1	10.1	26.9	3.3	0.63	5.7	81.0

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
1 VERMONT	12.8	7.5	21.9	3.3	0.06	8.9	99.8
50005 VERMONT CONSORTIUM	12.8	7.5	21.9	3.3	0.06	8.9	99.8

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
2 NEW JERSEY	18.3	10.7	19.7	4.1	1.02	7.6	94.0
34005 CAMDEN COUNTY	16.7	8.2	17.7	4.4	2.21	9.6	89.0
34010 UNION COUNTY	21.0	10.7	26.0	4.1	4.89	5.8	109.2
34015 JERSEY CITY IN HUDSON COUNTY	18.8	5.4	20.9	7.2	7.00	18.9	94.0
34020 NEWARK CITY IN ESSEX COUNTY	18.8	9.8	16.1	8.2	7.00	29.9	168.1
34025 PASSAIC COUNTY	17.9	11.2	31.0	4.5	2.46	10.5	90.6
34030 MERCER COUNTY	16.0	7.8	15.8	3.1	1.41	7.4	118.7
34035 ATLANTIC/CAPE MAY CONSORTIUM	13.6	8.4	5.7	5.6	0.36	8.1	102.7
34040 BERGEN COUNTY	22.6	13.3	22.4	2.7	3.53	3.1	92.5
34045 BURLINGTON COUNTY	15.5	12.4	18.1	3.4	0.48	5.1	75.5
34050 BALANCE OF ESSEX COUNTY LESS NEWARK CITY	18.8	9.8	16.1	3.6	5.11	6.7	84.9
34055 GLOUCESTER COUNTY	14.9	8.8	22.2	4.4	0.65	6.4	70.8
34060 BALANCE OF HUDSON COUNTY LESS JERSEY CITY	18.8	5.4	20.9	6.0	7.00	12.1	96.1
34070 MONMOUTH COUNTY	14.4	16.8	12.8	3.1	1.15	6.0	81.6
34080 OCEAN COUNTY	13.3	15.9	7.9	3.5	0.61	6.1	71.0
34090 SALEM/CUMBERLAND CONSORTIUM	13.2	6.8	31.1	6.5	0.24	11.1	107.0
34100 MIDDLESEX/SOMERSET/HUNTERDON CONSORTIUM	19.2	14.8	23.4	2.7	0.91	4.1	94.7
34105 MORRIS/SUSSEX/WARREN CONSORTIUM	17.9	10.9	21.6	2.6	0.46	3.3	85.3

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
2 NEW YORK	17.6	5.1	16.0	4.2	0.38	10.8	102.3
36005 ALBANY/RENSSELAER/SCHENECTADY CONSORTIUM	15.0	7.6	12.0	3.1	0.42	6.7	113.6
36015 NEW YORK CITY	22.3	5.6	10.9	5.0	7.00	17.2	117.4
36025 SYRACUSE CITY IN ONONDAGA COUNTY	15.0	0.7	18.3	6.0	6.75	12.9	169.3
36030 YONKERS CITY IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY	19.1	7.3	16.9	3.8	7.00	8.2	56.9
36035 BROOME/TIOGA CONSORTIUM	12.2	-0.0	32.8	3.6	0.21	6.2	103.3
36040 ALLEGHANY/CATTARAGUS/CHAUTAUQUA CONSORTIUM	10.4	-2.6	28.4	5.3	0.08	9.2	98.0
36045 CHEMUNG/SCHUYLER/STEBEN CONSORTIUM	11.2	0.3	28.8	4.5	0.10	8.9	102.6
36050 DUTCHESS/PUTNAM CONSORTIUM	14.3	5.7	25.7	2.6	0.33	5.0	85.5
36060 HEMPSTEAD/LONG BEACH CONSORTIUM	18.2	10.9	14.0	2.9	7.00	11.5	80.2
36065 JEFFERSON/LEWIS CONSORTIUM	11.0	-2.0	17.7	7.5	0.05	10.8	100.2
36075 BALANCE OF NASSAU COUNTY LESS	18.2	10.9	14.0	2.5	4.44	3.4	82.8
36080 NIAGARA COUNTY	9.9	-0.5	31.8	6.4	0.41	7.1	96.0
36085 BALANCE OF ONONDAGA COUNTY LESS SYRACUSE CITY	15.0	0.7	18.3	4.3	0.40	3.6	77.3
36090 HERKIMER/MADISON/ONEIDA CONSORTIUM	11.8	-0.0	20.6	5.0	0.12	8.7	94.9
36095 ORANGE COUNTY	14.2	12.8	16.2	3.5	0.34	7.9	89.4
36100 OSWEGO COUNTY	10.4	0.1	24.7	8.6	0.13	8.9	86.2
36105 ROCKLAND COUNTY	15.5	12.4	16.6	2.7	1.52	4.8	69.3
36110 ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY	10.5	-3.4	19.2	7.2	0.04	12.9	102.5
36115 SARATOGA/WARREN/WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM	12.4	7.0	20.5	4.2	0.11	7.5	77.6
36120 SUFFOLK COUNTY	16.2	10.3	20.0	3.5	1.44	5.3	76.6

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
2	NEW YORK	17.6	5.1	16.0	4.2	0.38	10.8	102.3
36125	ULSTER COUNTY	12.7	8.3	27.1	2.9	0.15	7.9	87.5
36130	BALANCE OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY LESS YONKERS CIT	19.1	7.3	16.9	2.7	1.61	4.8	97.4
36135	COLUMBIA/GREENE CONSORTIUM	11.5	4.9	17.5	3.6	0.08	8.5	80.4
36140	SULLIVAN COUNTY	14.0	10.5	4.2	3.8	0.07	10.2	92.1
36145	FULTON/MONTGOMERY/SCHOHARIE CONSORTIUM	11.1	2.1	32.6	7.2	0.09	8.5	87.3
36150	CLINTON/ESSEX/FRANKLIN/HAMILTON CONSORTIUM	10.7	4.2	15.1	6.6	0.03	10.3	97.5
36155	CHENANGO/DELAWARE/OTSEGO CONSORTIUM	11.7	1.1	25.4	4.2	0.05	9.5	98.4
36160	CAYUGA/CORTLAND/TOMPKINS CONSORTIUM	10.8	2.6	20.4	4.2	0.13	8.5	99.1
36165	ONTARIO/SENECA/WAYNE/YATES CONSORTIUM	11.5	3.8	27.5	5.2	0.12	6.7	83.0
36170	GENESEE/ORLEANS/LIVINGSTON/WYOMING CONSORTIUM	10.9	3.9	26.6	6.1	0.09	7.0	83.1
36175	BUFFALO/ERIE/CHEEKTOWAGA/TONAWANDA SDA	12.4	0.4	18.7	5.1	0.92	8.3	101.9
36180	ROCHESTER/MONROE SDA	13.6	3.3	31.3	3.4	1.06	6.5	109.2

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME		AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
3	DELAWARE	12.4	3.1	23.5	3.1	0.33	8.9	102.4
	10005 DELAWARE CONSORTIUM	12.4	3.1	23.5	3.1	0.33	8.9	102.5

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87) -----	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87) -----	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (PY 87) -----	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87) -----	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7) -----	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79) -----	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO -----
3 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	15.5	-0.5	3.7	5.6	7.00	15.1	233.4
11005 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	15.5	-0.5	3.7	5.6	7.00	15.1	233.4

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
3	MARYLAND	15.4	5.3	11.6	4.3	0.45	7.5	89.1
24005	BALTIMORE CONSORTIUM	15.7	4.3	12.2	5.1	1.18	12.4	114.8
24010	BALTIMORE COUNTY	14.6	4.3	16.7	4.0	1.12	4.1	71.8
24015	FREDERICK COUNTY	13.4	8.0	14.0	3.5	0.20	4.9	76.8
24020	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	17.8	8.0	5.4	2.5	1.34	3.0	89.8
24025	PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY	16.9	7.2	5.4	3.5	1.40	4.9	68.2
24030	WESTERN MARYLAND CONSORTIUM	11.8	1.2	20.9	8.1	0.14	9.0	105.3
24035	LOWER SHORE CONSORTIUM	12.4	8.0	20.7	6.5	0.10	9.5	101.7
24040	UPPER SHORE CONSORTIUM	12.0	8.3	27.6	5.0	0.07	9.1	89.1
24045	SUSQUEHANNA REGION	12.0	3.7	10.8	5.0	0.28	6.4	71.2
24050	SOUTHERN MARYLAND CONSORTIUM	12.5	3.6	8.8	4.0	0.19	7.2	68.3

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
3	PENNSYLVANIA		13.9	3.0	22.6	5.4	0.26	7.8	100.4
		42005 ALLEGHENY COUNTY (LESS PGH)	14.2	-0.7	14.0	5.2	1.47	4.8	77.8
		42010 BEAVER COUNTY	10.1	-1.1	20.9	9.6	0.44	5.8	94.6
		42015 BERKS COUNTY	13.3	8.5	35.1	4.6	0.37	5.6	97.7
		42020 BUCKS COUNTY	15.3	9.4	24.4	3.6	0.86	4.7	78.4
		42025 MID-STATE CONSORTIUM	10.4	2.0	28.5	6.0	0.09	8.3	102.6
		42030 CHESTER COUNTY	17.5	12.3	27.0	3.0	0.45	4.7	85.2
		42035 DELAWARE COUNTY	15.2	6.8	19.4	3.5	3.05	5.8	75.2
		42040 ERIE COUNTY	11.2	2.9	33.0	6.7	0.35	7.4	102.8
		42045 WESTMORELAND/FAYETTE	11.8	-4.0	23.5	8.3	0.29	7.6	81.2
		42050 FRANKLIN/ADAMS	10.1	1.8	31.3	4.4	0.15	5.7	88.6
		42055 LACKAWANNA COUNTY	11.3	1.7	27.8	5.8	0.48	7.2	98.6
		42060 LANCASTER COUNTY	13.1	9.4	36.1	3.7	0.41	6.0	97.6
		42070 LEHIGH VALLEY	13.2	4.7	30.0	4.7	0.71	5.4	100.7
		42075 LUZERNE/SCHUYLKILL	11.4	3.9	30.4	7.3	0.29	7.4	93.7
		42080 MONTGOMERY COUNTY	17.1	10.3	24.0	3.2	1.38	3.3	107.3
		42085 CENTRAL REGION TRAINING CENTER	10.5	-0.1	34.9	6.3	0.13	7.7	101.5
		42090 PHILADELPHIA CITY	17.0	2.5	15.1	5.8	7.00	16.6	126.2
		42095 PITTSBURGH CITY	14.2	-0.7	14.0	5.9	6.99	11.9	199.2
		42100 SOUTHERN ALLEGHENY	11.2	-0.6	23.6	7.8	0.11	8.8	98.3
		42105 SUSQUEHANNA	14.0	5.9	18.9	4.0	0.29	5.7	105.6

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
3	PENNSYLVANIA	13.9	3.0	22.6	5.4	0.26	7.8	100.4
42110	TRI-COUNTY	11.0	-3.8	30.5	7.7	0.14	6.4	91.6
42115	WASHINGTON/GREENE	12.0	1.1	23.7	8.0	0.18	7.2	87.9
42120	YORK COUNTY	13.2	5.2	36.3	4.4	0.36	5.1	97.1
42125	SIX COUNTIES (SIXCO)	11.0	-3.2	37.8	7.7	0.05	7.6	96.3
42130	NORTHERN TIER	9.9	2.0	35.2	5.9	0.05	10.4	87.4
42135	POCONO COUNTIES	11.6	9.3	17.4	5.4	0.09	6.8	87.7
42140	NW TRAINING PARTNERSHIP CONSORTIUM	11.3	-0.7	28.0	7.3	0.07	7.5	96.3
42145	WEST CENTRAL JOB PARTNERSHIP	10.6	-4.2	25.6	6.1	0.22	7.2	99.1

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
3	VIRGINIA		13.9	1.7	18.8	3.9	0.15	9.2	93.7
		51005 ALEXANDRIA/ARLINGTON CONSORTIUM	19.7	2.4	3.3	2.0	6.50	5.5	126.3
		51010 NORTHERN VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM	16.8	8.1	7.3	1.8	0.79	3.4	66.2
		51015 CAPITAL AREA CONSORTIUM	15.2	1.9	14.9	2.5	0.22	5.0	56.3
		51020 JOB TRAINING SERVICES (JTS)	11.1	-1.3	23.3	4.4	0.64	9.6	104.2
		51025 OFF. OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEV.(RICHMOND)	16.4	-1.0	14.9	4.6	3.63	15.0	202.2
		51030 FIFTH DISTRICT CONSORTIUM	13.4	-5.3	19.3	4.4	0.16	8.4	108.2
		51035 SE VA JOB TRAINING ADMIN. (SVJTA)	12.4	-0.4	13.9	4.5	0.47	12.4	91.5
		51040 SDA-ONE, INC	11.7	-1.8	32.9	10.1	0.07	15.1	94.8
		51045 NEW RIVER/MOUNT ROGERS CONSORTIUM	9.9	-4.6	39.9	6.2	0.08	10.7	97.4
		51050 SHENANDOAH VALLEY CONSORTIUM	11.6	1.6	33.3	4.2	0.07	8.4	99.6
		51055 PIEDMONT CONSORTIUM	12.0	-0.1	17.9	3.0	0.06	9.8	92.9
		51060 CENTRAL "IEDMONT CONSORTIUM	11.2	1.3	45.4	5.6	0.09	9.1	98.0
		51065 SOUTH CENTRAL VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM	10.3	-1.2	25.7	6.5	0.05	14.1	95.2
		51070 BAY AREA	12.2	1.7	22.4	4.4	0.07	10.9	82.3

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
3 WEST VIRGINIA	12.1	-4.9	22.0	10.2	0.08	11.7	101.2
54005 KANAWHA COUNTY	14.3	-5.3	13.3	8.5	0.25	8.2	112.6
54015 NORTHERN PANHANDLE JT CONSORTIUM	11.1	-5.7	30.4	8.3	0.17	8.1	111.4
54020 BALANCE OF WEST VIRGINIA CONSORTIUM	11.7	-4.4	22.6	10.8	0.07	12.8	97.5

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4	ALABAMA		13.0	-1.1	26.7	7.2	0.08	14.8	98.3
		01005 BIRMINGHAM CITY/JEFFERSON COUNTY	15.6	-0.3	13.9	6.0	0.60	12.0	111.2
		01010 MOBILE CITY/MOBILE COUNTY	13.6	-2.4	17.7	9.5	0.31	15.4	102.9
		01015 GOVERNOR'S UNIFIED TRAINING AREA (GUTA)	11.9	-0.8	32.1	7.3	0.06	15.4	94.3

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 FLORIDA	14.2	3.2	13.7	5.1	0.22	9.9	99.7
12005 NORTH CENTRAL FLORIDA REG. TRG. COUNCIL							
12010 BREVARD COUNTY E & T ADM	10.4	-1.3	13.4	4.6	0.05	16.3	101.0
12015 BROWARD COUNTY E & T ADM	12.0	5.5	20.9	4.9	0.36	7.3	100.4
12020 JOB TRG PROG OF NW FLORIDA, INC (PIC)	14.7	7.5	10.8	4.2	0.94	6.3	90.0
12025 HEARTLAND PIC	11.5	-4.7	9.8	5.9	0.41	14.0	105.3
12030 VOLUSIA/LAKE/FLAGLER PIC	13.4	-0.4	23.8	8.1	0.10	11.4	100.0
12035 LEON COUNTY DEPT OF E & T	11.4	2.1	14.7	4.9	0.18	9.8	98.8
12040 LEE COUNTY DEPT OF HUMAN RESOURCES	11.3	-0.6	7.2	4.0	0.10	15.4	101.5
12045 WITHLACOCHEE PIC	12.8	6.2	8.0	3.6	0.35	7.7	99.5
12050 MANASOTA IND COUNCIL, INC	11.4	-0.6	17.3	6.0	0.09	12.7	93.4
12055 SOUTH FLORIDA E & T CONSORTIUM	12.5	4.8	15.0	3.9	0.32	6.8	101.6
12060 PIC OF JACKSONVILLE	16.2	3.8	12.7	5.4	0.62	11.8	105.3
12065 (OKALOOSA/SANTA ROSA/WALTON)	15.8	-1.3	10.5	5.3	0.83	12.7	105.9
12070 ORANGE COUNTY T & E OFFICE	9.7	-2.5	12.9	6.2	0.08	11.5	90.6
12075 PALM BEACH COUNTY PIC	15.2	1.5	13.2	4.6	0.29	9.9	112.4
12080 PIC OF PASCO, INC	15.2	11.5	15.8	5.1	0.38	6.7	103.1
12085 BUSINESS & IND EMPL DEV COUNCIL, INC(PINELLAS)	11.4	5.4	11.9	5.7	0.33	7.7	84.5
12090 PIC OF SEMINOLE COUNTY	12.9	4.0	15.3	4.2	2.91	6.5	98.3
12095 CITY OF TAMPA	13.5	4.3	15.6	4.5	0.81	7.0	64.7
12100 HILLSBOROUGH BD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	15.9	3.6	12.7	5.3	2.66	14.8	179.6
	15.9	3.6	12.7	4.4	0.53	8.0	51.0

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 FLORIDA	14.2	3.2	13.7	5.1	0.22	9.9	99.7
12105 FLORIDA PANHANDLE PIC	10.3	-3.0	12.2	8.2	0.04	16.2	94.9
12110 NE FLORIDA REG PLG COUNCIL	10.9	1.6	17.5	5.4	0.09	11.7	73.8
12115 TREASURE COAST JOB TRG CTR	12.4	5.9	18.1	8.0	0.18	9.6	100.6
12120 SOUTHWEST FLORIDA PIC	12.7	5.8	20.9	5.3	0.05	9.3	100.8

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 GEORGIA	16.8	2.4	20.2	5.7	0.11	13.2	99.9
13005 ATLANTA CITY IN DEKALB & FULTON COUNTIES	21.1	3.9	10.2	7.5	3.22	23.7	222.9
13010 CLAYTON COUNTY	15.0	-0.1	8.1	4.9	1.15	6.9	81.2
13015 CENTRAL SAVANNAH RIVER AREA (CSRA)	11.8	-1.3	22.8	6.6	0.07	16.6	102.3
13025 DEKALB COUNTY SDA	19.0	3.4	12.6	4.7	1.96	7.3	89.9
13035 MID GEORGIA CONSORTIUM	12.1	-1.3	18.5	5.5	0.14	13.5	101.9
13040 SAVANNAH-CHATHAM COUNTY	12.7	1.0	17.4	6.4	0.49	14.7	106.0
13050 GEORGIA MOUNTAINS	11.7	4.6	38.3	4.8	0.08	12.0	89.9
13055 NORTHEAST GEORGIA	11.5	1.6	32.1	5.4	0.09	13.2	94.1
13060 WEST CENTRAL GEORGIA	11.8	1.9	38.5	5.7	0.11	11.7	85.0
13065 HEART OF GEORGIA/OCONEE	10.2	0.8	34.5	6.8	0.03	18.2	94.3
13075 SOUTHWEST GEORGIA	11.6	-1.9	29.5	7.9	0.06	18.5	100.6
13085 NORTH GEORGIA	13.7	6.2	49.0	5.4	0.10	11.2	86.6
13090 COOSA VALLEY	11.9	2.9	42.8	6.3	0.11	10.7	81.2
13095 SOUTH GEORGIA	11.1	-2.1	31.5	5.8	0.06	18.1	99.8
13100 SOUTHEAST GEORGIA	10.9	3.3	33.0	7.9	0.03	18.9	95.8
13105 COBB-DOUGLAS CONSORTIUM	19.1	15.9	17.7	3.8	0.84	5.0	64.7
13110 LOWER CHATTAHOOCHEE CONSORTIUM	11.9	0.7	22.0	6.5	0.10	15.8	93.2
13115 ALTAMAHA-GEORGIA SOUTHERN CONSORTIUM	11.2	1.6	30.1	6.1	0.04	19.6	97.9
13120 MIDDLE FLINT CONSORTIUM	10.9	-5.2	34.1	7.6	0.03	22.9	102.4
13125 COASTAL CONSORTIUM	9.9	-5.5	18.7	5.9	0.05	15.3	91.4
13130 BALANCE OF FULTON COUNTY LESS ATLANTA CITY	21.1	3.9	10.2	3.4	0.50	4.3	104.6
13135 GWINNETT-ROCKDALE CONSORTIUM	18.1	6.6	23.1	4.0	0.57	4.9	63.4

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 KENTUCKY	11.7	-3.8	24.5	8.4	0.09	14.6	99.5
21005 PURCHASE-PENNYRILE SDA (AREA A)	10.8	-4.4	25.8	8.6	0.06	12.2	104.7
21010 TEN-CO SDA (AREA F)	10.7	-1.7	30.1	10.4	0.07	15.2	104.2
21015 LOUISVILLE CITY/JEFFERSON COUNTY SDA(AREA C)	14.1	-3.6	21.5	6.8	1.76	9.7	115.6
21020 NORTH CENTRAL KY COUNCIL SDA (AREA D)	9.8	-3.6	25.3	5.7	0.08	9.8	52.0
21025 NORTHERN KY SDA (AREA E)	11.6	2.3	16.3	6.2	0.19	8.8	71.8
21035 EASTERN KY CEP SDA (AREA G)	10.9	-8.6	26.3	14.3	0.06	24.3	98.6
21040 THE CUMBERLANDS SDA (AREA H)	10.2	-5.5	34.5	9.6	0.06	23.7	97.1
21045 BLUE GRASS SDA (AREA I)	11.1	-2.7	21.7	6.3	0.13	12.7	102.7
21050 LINCOLN TRAIL SDA (AREA B)	9.6	-4.5	21.9	8.8	0.07	16.0	89.9
21055 GREEN RIVER SDA (AREA J)	11.2	-4.1	31.9	10.0	0.08	11.1	99.1
21060 BARREN RIVER SDA (AREA K)	10.2	-3.7	35.5	10.2	0.06	16.1	98.1

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4	MISSISSIPPI		12.4	-3.2	26.7	8.4	0.06	18.7	97.9
		28010 GULF COAST BUSINESS SERVICES CORP	10.5	-2.1	14.2	7.9	0.19	14.1	106.3
		28025 CAPITAL AREA T & E CONSORTIUM	14.8	-2.8	12.8	5.6	0.33	12.8	113.1
		28030 MISSISSIPPI SDA	12.0	-3.2	30.7	9.2	0.05	19.5	93.6

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
4	NORTH CAROLINA	13.3	1.8	31.2	4.0	0.13	11.6	100.1
37005	ALAMANCE COUNTY	11.5	0.8	42.4	3.6	0.24	7.4	94.1
37010	BUNCOMBE COUNTY	11.9	0.2	25.9	3.7	0.26	10.1	105.5
37015	CUMBERLAND COUNTY	11.1	2.3	14.7	4.9	0.39	14.8	104.7
37020	DAVIDSON COUNTY	11.7	-1.0	53.1	2.8	0.22	8.2	77.3
37030	CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM AND FORSYTH COUNTY	13.6	2.3	27.7	3.3	0.63	8.4	120.5
37035	GASTON COUNTY	12.5	-0.6	51.1	3.3	0.48	8.2	92.3
37040	CITY OF GREENSBORO & HIGH POINT & GUILFORD COU	16.1	1.8	28.5	3.3	0.50	8.3	118.0
37045	CITY OF CHARLOTTE AND MECKLENBURG COUNTY	18.4	3.1	15.6	3.0	0.85	8.3	125.3
37055	CENTRALINA CONSORTIUM	12.2	1.0	44.0	3.7	0.17	7.7	86.2
37065	SOUTHWESTERN N.C. SDA	9.6	0.2	28.8	6.2	0.05	15.6	93.2
37070	LAND-OF-SKY JOB TRAINING CONSORTIUM	10.5	-2.2	33.2	3.5	0.09	11.5	94.0
37075	REGION C JOB TRAINING CONSORTIUM	11.5	2.1	50.8	3.9	0.11	10.3	94.8
37080	REGION D SDA	11.6	1.2	35.8	3.9	0.07	14.6	91.0
37090	REGION H JTPA CONSORTIUM	10.2	2.5	45.5	4.3	0.07	11.6	98.1
37095	NORTHWEST PIEDMONT SDA	11.1	-0.6	47.7	4.5	0.10	10.8	78.2
37100	KERR-TAR INTERLOCAL COOPERATIVE CONSORTIUM	10.1	-3.3	41.9	5.9	0.06	15.9	81.3
37105	REGION L SDA	12.3	0.7	32.8	5.9	0.10	17.9	100.6
37115	LUMBER RIVER JOB TRAINING CONSORTIUM	10.4	-0.9	48.9	6.6	0.08	19.7	96.4
37120	CAPE FEAR SDA	10.8	0.3	21.8	6.1	0.08	15.5	98.2
37125	NEUSE RIVER JOB TRAINING CONSORTIUM	10.6	-0.8	22.9	4.4	0.10	15.5	97.9

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (CY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 NORTH CAROLINA	13.3	1.8	31.2	4.0	0.13	11.6	100.1
37130 ALBERMARLE INTERLOCAL COPRT. CONSRT. FOR JOB TRN	10.3	1.8	15.5	4.0	0.04	16.2	89.0
37140 CENTRAL PIEDMONT CONSORTIUM	12.5	-2.2	25.4	2.9	0.56	9.5	116.7
37145 RURAL SDA	11.2	3.9	37.6	3.8	0.14	9.9	87.2
37150 WESTERN PIEDMONT JOB TRAINING CONSORT.	13.0	0.3	55.0	3.2	0.19	7.0	106.9
37155 BURKE COUNTY	11.1	-0.6	54.3	3.2	0.15	7.6	92.7
37160 REGION Q SDA	10.8	3.9	29.8	4.6	0.07	18.5	99.0
37165 CAPITOL AREA JT CONSORTIUM	15.1	3.9	16.1	3.2	0.23	9.5	100.3
37170 REGION "M" SDA	11.7	0.8	43.9	4.9	0.07	12.2	89.0

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4	SOUTH CAROLINA		11.7	-0.4	29.8	5.2	0.11	13.1	98.2
45010	SDA #1--ANDERSON, OCONEE, AND PICKENS COUNTIES		10.2	-1.2	41.6	4.9	0.15	9.3	91.4
45015	SDA #4--GREENVILLE COUNTY E&T		13.9	1.5	30.6	3.7	0.39	9.1	112.8
45020	SDA #3--CHEROKEE, SPARTANBURG AND UNION COUNTI		12.1	-2.0	43.2	4.5	0.16	10.5	97.5
45025	SDA #2--UPPER SAVANNAH		10.1	-4.8	47.1	6.1	0.06	11.8	91.3
45030	SDA #5--RICHLAND COUNTY SDA		13.4	-1.6	9.4	4.1	0.36	11.6	124.2
45035	SDA #6--CHARLESTON COUNTY E&T		11.6	-2.0	13.5	4.7	0.31	14.5	121.7
45040	SOUTH CAROLINA BALANCE OF STATE		10.8	1.2	32.1	5.8	0.08	15.1	88.3

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
4 TENNESSEE	13.7	2.6	26.8	6.0	0.12	13.1	101.0
47005 JSTD 1 (JOB SKILLS TRG DIST-JOHNSON CITY)	11.8	-0.9	36.1	6.3	0.21	11.7	104.0
47010 JSTD 2 (MORRISTON)	10.0	-1.8	43.0	8.9	0.09	17.0	86.6
47025 JSTD 5 (CLEVELAND)	11.0	5.3	46.6	6.6	0.08	13.2	94.9
47030 JSTD 6 (CHATTANOOGA)	13.3	0.6	25.1	5.7	0.15	11.9	115.1
47035 JSTD 7 (COOKEVILLE)	10.0	-0.7	45.9	7.2	0.05	16.4	92.7
47040 JSTD 8 (NASHVILLE)	12.1	6.8	32.6	5.6	0.10	9.5	71.2
47045 JSTD 9 (NASHVILLE/DAVIDSON)	15.8	4.7	13.8	3.9	0.99	9.2	124.0
47050 JSTD 10 (TULLAHOMA)	11.3	3.6	37.8	5.6	0.09	10.9	90.0
47055 JSTD 11 (COLUMBIA)	10.7	4.3	48.0	7.9	0.04	13.1	94.5
47060 JSTD 12 (JACKSON)	10.5	-0.3	40.7	8.2	0.05	15.3	95.9
47065 JSTD 13 (DYERSBURG)	10.8	0.6	46.9	6.7	0.06	15.4	95.0
47070 JSTD 14 (MEMPHIS)	16.1	2.6	14.0	5.0	0.57	15.6	107.5
47075 JSTD 3 (KNOXVILLE, KNOX COUNTY)	13.9	4.3	16.9	4.7	0.39	10.8	110.0
47080 JSTD 4 (HARRIMAN)	11.1	3.6	37.4	6.7	0.08	13.6	95.7

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
5	ILLINOIS	17.6	2.9	20.3	6.9	0.21	8.4	99.8
17005 SDA 1 LAKE COUNTY PIC		15.8	-1.0	23.7	4.4	1.06	3.9	85.5
17010 SDA 2 MCHENRY COUNTY JTPA		12.4	1.1	36.4	5.2	0.27	3.3	73.4
17015 SDA 3 ROCK RIVER TRG CORP		14.0	7.6	35.6	8.3	0.35	6.4	103.3
17020 SDA 4 WHITESIDE COUNTY BOARD JTPA		11.1	-3.0	39.0	7.4	0.06	5.8	92.0
17025 SDA 5 KDK JOB TRG DEPT		14.4	-5.1	27.3	5.3	0.28	4.5	92.2
17030 SDA 6 DU PAGE COUNTY BOARD		17.1	0.9	16.2	4.0	2.16	2.3	80.4
17035 SDA 7 PRESIDENT'S OFFICE OF E & T		18.9	4.1	19.7	5.6	5.43	11.2	107.4
17040 SDA 8 NORTHWEST MUNICIPAL CONF.		18.9	4.1	19.7	4.2	7.00	2.4	123.2
17045 SDA 9 MAYOR'S OFFICE OF E & T		18.9	4.1	19.7	7.9	5.02	7.8	148.9
17050 SDA 10 WILL COUNTY PIC		12.6	5.0	21.3	7.5	0.40	4.9	69.0
17055 SDA 11 (GLK PIC)		11.7	-4.3	20.5	9.1	0.08	7.7	96.2
17060 SDA 12 (BEST INC.)		11.4	-1.8	26.8	10.4	0.06	5.4	97.2
17065 SDA 13 (ROCK ISLAND TRI-COUNTY CONSORTIUM)		13.1	-4.7	30.8	8.3	0.13	6.4	106.2
17070 SDA 14 (PIC FOR SDA 14)		10.8	-7.6	20.5	8.1	0.04	8.9	97.4
17075 SDA 15 (CENTRAL ILLINOIS PIC)		13.3	1.3	18.2	7.0	0.13	6.8	109.3
17080 SDA 16 (UNITED PIC)		11.7	-3.4	21.4	6.7	0.09	5.8	92.7
17085 SDA 17 CHAMPAIGN CONSORTIUM		11.8	-1.4	12.8	5.1	0.08	6.7	97.7
17090 SDA 18 VERMILLION COUNTY JOB TRG PTRSP		11.4	-1.1	29.5	11.2	0.10	9.1	106.9
17095 SDA 19 MACON CO. E & T GRANTS ADM		12.2	0.6	27.1	9.3	0.15	7.8	112.5
17100 SDA 20 LAND OF LINCOLN CONSORTIUM		12.1	-4.4	6.4	6.1	0.09	6.4	102.0

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY86-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (CY86-CY87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5	ILLINOIS	17.6	2.9	20.3	6.9	0.21	8.4	99.8
17105	SDA 21 PIC FOR SDA 21	11.0	-3.2	21.0	8.8	0.04	8.2	82.4
17110	SDA 22 MADISON COUNTY E & T	12.3	-0.3	25.7	8.3	0.24	7.7	90.0
17115	SDA 23 PIC FOR SDA 23	11.4	-4.0	28.2	9.7	0.05	8.1	99.6
17120	SDA 24 (ST. CLAIR COUNTY)	10.9	-6.2	16.4	9.4	0.14	11.8	85.3
17125	SDA 25 PIC FOR SDA 25	10.6	-6.1	21.0	13.3	0.09	10.0	99.8
17130	SDA 26 PIC FOR SDA 26	10.6	-9.3	28.1	14.2	0.04	12.0	95.5

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5 INDIANA	12.7	0.9	28.8	5.6	0.15	7.3	99.0
18005 LAKE COUNTY	11.5	-3.6	25.0	7.8	0.98	9.2	105.7
18010 KANKAKEE VALLEY SDA	11.0	-2.6	30.7	6.1	0.11	5.7	85.5
18015 ST. JOSEPH COUNTY	13.0	3.1	22.4	5.1	0.53	6.7	99.4
18020 NORTHERN INDIANA SDA	12.9	1.8	53.5	4.3	0.15	6.7	106.8
18025 NORTHEASTERN INDIANA SDA	13.0	-0.5	33.3	4.8	0.16	5.9	101.6
18030 TECUMSEH AREA SDA	10.6	-2.0	28.6	4.5	0.08	6.0	96.3
18035 NORTH CENTRAL INDIANA SDA	10.7	-0.9	41.9	6.3	0.11	6.4	102.2
18040 GRANT/MADISON SDA	10.1	-0.7	37.8	6.8	0.24	7.5	100.3
18045 EAST CENTRAL INDIANA SDA	11.0	1.8	30.5	7.0	0.13	8.7	95.0
18050 WESTERN INDIANA SDA	13.2	-0.6	22.6	6.2	0.10	7.7	97.6
18055 INDIANAPOLIS CITY/MARION COUNTY	15.9	3.3	18.6	5.0	1.98	8.4	123.4
18060 CIRCLE SEVEN SDA	12.6	3.9	20.7	4.1	0.16	4.8	60.1
18065 SOUTHEASTERN INDIANA SDA	10.8	1.1	36.3	7.1	0.08	8.7	93.2
18070 SOUTH CENTRAL INDIANA SDA	10.3	-1.6	31.0	4.8	0.11	8.1	101.7
18075 SHAWNEE TRACE SDA	10.7	-2.0	30.9	6.8	0.06	8.3	94.8
18080 HOOSIER FALLS SDA	11.0	2.7	27.9	5.8	0.10	8.5	75.8
18085 SOUTHWEST INDIANA SDA	12.3	0.0	26.7	6.1	0.15	7.1	104.2

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5	MICHIGAN								
		26005 LIVINGSTON/MASHTENAW	15.6	1.0	27.1	8.2	0.16	8.2	99.4
		26010 DETROIT CITY	13.1	5.8	24.7	4.5	0.29	5.3	103.9
		26015 MACOMB/ST. CLAIR CONSORTIUM	16.7	-1.1	26.6	11.7	7.00	18.9	128.5
		26020 BAY/MIDLAND/SAGINAW CONSORTIUM	14.3	3.7	38.6	8.2	0.69	4.6	84.3
		26030 GENESSEE/SHIAWASSEE	12.0	-1.0	30.8	8.0	0.23	8.8	102.8
		26035 GRAND RAPIDS AREA E&T CONSORTIUM	15.4	-4.9	34.0	13.5	0.43	8.9	103.8
		26040 KALAMAZOO/ST. JOSEPH	15.6	2.4	30.0	6.0	0.55	6.7	111.8
		26045 LANSING/TRI-COUNTY E&T CONSORTIUM	12.2	-3.2	34.6	5.9	0.26	7.5	106.4
		26050 MID COUNTIES CONSORTIUM	12.8	-4.1	20.1	6.6	0.25	7.0	103.4
		26055 MUSKEGON/OCEANA CONSORTIUM	11.7	-0.9	30.4	7.9	0.13	8.1	95.7
		26060 NORTHEAST MICHIGAN CONSORTIUM	11.7	-4.5	32.9	9.4	0.17	10.1	97.0
		26065 OAKLAND COUNTY	9.7	-3.1	20.9	11.8	0.02	11.2	97.7
		26070 GREATER PONTIAC CONSORTIUM	17.8	8.1	20.8	6.0	1.04	3.2	87.2
		26075 ALLEGAN/OTTAWA CONSORTIUM	17.8	8.1	20.8	10.7	6.20	15.3	286.0
		26080 REGION II CONSORTIUM	12.5	4.0	45.9	5.0	0.18	5.1	83.0
		26090 WESTERN UPPER PENINSULA CONSORTIUM	12.1	-1.3	32.9	8.3	0.13	7.3	92.9
		26095 REGION 7-8	8.3	-5.8	13.5	9.3	0.01	9.4	97.6
		26100 WEST CENTRAL MICHIGAN CONSORTIUM	9.0	-4.2	17.5	9.1	0.04	11.8	89.3
		26105 NORTHWEST MICHIGAN CONSORTIUM	9.5	-5.7	30.1	9.0	0.04	11.0	88.0
		26110 BERRIEN/CASS/VAN BUREN	11.4	-2.7	26.1	9.1	0.05	8.3	101.2
			11.9	1.8	38.0	7.2	0.17	10.6	88.4

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5	MICHIGAN	15.6	1.0	27.1	8.2	0.16	8.2	99.4
26115	EASTERN UPPER PENINSULA CONSORTIUM	9.2	-7.8	8.8	13.5	0.01	10.9	99.6
26120	THUMB AREA CONSORTIUM	11.3	-8.5	32.2	10.9	0.06	8.0	76.5
26125	SIX COUNTY CONSORTIUM	10.1	-4.5	22.6	8.4	0.03	7.6	98.3
26130	CENTRAL AREA PARTNERSHIP CONSORTIUM	10.3	-9.9	28.5	8.7	0.08	8.9	89.2
26135	DOWNRIVER COMM CONFCE/MONROE CNTY	16.6	-1.2	26.6	7.4	0.56	5.5	68.1
26140	WAYNE COUNTY	16.7	-1.1	26.6	6.3	2.01	5.1	99.8

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000'S PFR SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5 MINNESOTA	14.9	0.7	20.7	4.4	0.05	7.0	100.2
27005 DULUTH CITY IN ST. LOUIS COUNTY	11.0	-4.7	14.2	6.3	1.22	7.3	130.9
27010 MINNEAPOLIS CITY IN HENNEPIN COUNTY	17.9	0.7	17.9	4.0	6.48	9.0	150.4
27015 ST. PAUL N RAMSEY COUNTY	13.5	0.8	27.7	4.4	5.03	8.0	157.6
27025 HENNEPIN/SCOTT/CARVER	17.7	0.8	18.3	3.4	0.60	3.0	95.8
27030 SOUTH CENTRAL MN	10.5	-2.9	28.6	4.7	0.04	7.9	97.8
27035 NORTHEAST MN CONSORTIUM	10.6	-3.9	16.3	8.7	0.01	6.9	86.8
27040 RURAL MINNESOTA CEP	9.4	-3.6	13.0	6.5	0.02	13.0	94.1
27045 NORTHWEST MN CONSORTIUM	11.5	1.3	23.0	8.0	0.01	11.1	98.0
27055 SOUTHWEST MN CONSORTIUM	10.1	-3.5	17.3	5.1	0.02	12.2	101.5
27075 SOUTHEAST MN CONSORTIUM	10.5	0.6	23.3	4.3	0.06	6.7	98.7
27080 WINONA CO.	10.1	-4.7	37.5	4.1	0.07	6.3	101.0
27085 ANOKA CO.	13.3	-1.5	26.5	4.1	0.51	3.8	61.1
27090 DAKOTA CO.	14.1	1.3	15.8	3.9	0.40	3.6	67.2
27095 BAL. OF RAMSEY CO. LESS ST. PAUL	13.5	0.8	27.7	3.0	2.07	3.1	74.9
27100 WASHINGTON COUNTY	10.6	-2.2	23.9	3.7	0.33	3.4	56.2
27105 PIC #5 CONSORTIUM	10.2	-0.3	22.1	6.0	0.04	7.7	81.5
27110 STEARNS COUNTY	11.8	-1.3	19.8	5.0	0.08	8.6	103.5

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5 OHIO	14.3	-1.3	24.9	6.2	0.26	8.0	100.5
39005 CINCINNATI CITY IN HAMILTON COUNTY	16.7	1.9	24.1	6.6	4.74	16.0	182.6
39010 CLEVELAND CITY IN CUYAHOGA COUNTY	16.5	-1.6	22.3	8.8	6.78	18.8	184.3
39015 MONTGOMERY/PREBLE/DAYTON CONSORTIUM	13.5	0.7	23.6	5.4	0.69	8.7	106.2
39020 YOUNGSTOWN CITY IN MAHONING COUNTY	12.1	-2.3	16.0	11.5	3.03	14.6	160.1
39025 AKRON/SUMMIT/MEDINA CONSORTIUM	14.1	0.5	26.4	6.4	0.75	6.5	95.6
39030 OHIO 2 CONSORTIUM (ALLEN-MERCER)	11.4	-4.0	34.7	7.2	0.13	7.5	104.8
39035 ASHTABULA/GEAUGA CONSORTIUM	11.2	-5.0	33.2	8.0	0.16	5.7	74.7
39040 BUTLER COUNTY	13.4	1.5	27.8	6.3	0.58	7.1	84.7
39045 OHIO 23 CONSORTIUM (CARROLL-WAYNE)	11.9	-4.4	32.6	6.8	0.25	7.0	96.4
39050 CENTRAL OHIO RURAL CONSORTIUM	11.1	0.5	30.2	6.9	0.12	7.3	89.8
39055 OHIO 11 (TECUMSEH) CONSORTIUM	11.3	-1.2	27.2	5.2	0.18	7.7	89.4
39060 CLERMONT-WARREN CONSORTIUM	11.2	-1.7	19.4	6.4	0.29	6.5	52.8
39065 COLUMBIANA/MAHONING CONSORTIUM	11.6	-3.6	19.5	7.1	0.31	6.0	68.1
39070 FRANKLIN COUNTY	15.1	-0.1	14.0	4.6	1.67	8.9	109.9
39075 BALANCE OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY LESS CLEVELAND CITY	16.5	-1.6	22.3	4.1	2.39	3.7	81.5
39080 BALANCE OF HAMILTON COUNTY LESS CINCINNATI CIT	16.7	1.9	24.1	3.8	1.48	3.7	89.4
39085 LAKE COUNTY	12.9	3.9	32.3	6.8	0.92	3.1	81.5
39090 LORAIN COUNTY	11.2	-3.5	33.3	7.3	0.55	7.0	90.0
39095 PORTAGE COUNTY	11.9	7.2	28.4	6.7	0.28	6.3	69.2
39100 OHIO 14 CONSORTIUM (ASHLAND-RICHLAND)	11.2	-2.9	34.6	6.7	0.13	7.6	94.9

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5 OHIO	14.3	-1.3	24.9	6.2	0.26	8.0	100.5
39105 OHIO 18 CONSORTIUM (ADAMS-SCIOTO)	10.0	-4.6	23.9	10.5	0.07	14.4	90.5
39110 TOLEDO AREA CONSORTIUM	13.6	-6.6	22.6	6.2	0.60	8.3	105.5
39115 TRUMBULL COUNTY	10.7	-3.2	39.4	8.7	0.38	6.7	103.9
39120 OHIO 1 CONSORTIUM (DEFIANCE-WILLIAMS)	11.4	-2.7	43.9	7.1	0.08	5.6	92.6
39125 OHIO 3 CONSORTIUM (DARKE-SHELBY)	11.8	-5.0	41.6	6.0	0.12	6.7	91.1
39130 OHIO 10 CONSORTIUM (CRAWFORD-WYANDOT)	11.4	-2.3	37.7	6.8	0.12	7.2	101.0
39135 OHIO 13 CONSORTIUM (ERIE-SENECA)	11.0	-2.1	36.4	7.8	0.15	6.0	96.0
39140 OHIO 17 CONSORTIUM (CLINTON-ROSS)	10.8	-0.2	29.9	7.5	0.11	8.0	89.0
39145 OHIO 24 CONSORTIUM (ATHENS-VINTON)	10.5	-4.2	21.1	9.7	0.08	12.4	81.7
39150 OHIO 31 CONSORTIUM (BELMONT-WASHINGTON)	10.5	-4.3	26.5	9.4	0.09	8.2	95.4

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (10005 PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
5	WISCONSIN		11.9	-0.3	27.5	5.3	0.09	6.3	98.8
		55005 DANE COUNTY	12.1	0.3	12.8	3.4	0.29	4.7	102.6
		55010 MARATHON COUNTY	12.0	-1.3	29.5	5.8	0.07	6.2	98.0
		55015 MILWAUKEE COUNTY	13.9	-0.2	23.2	5.0	3.87	8.0	112.8
		55020 NORTHERN LAKE WINNEBAGO CONSORTIUM	11.7	-3.2	33.1	5.3	0.13	5.0	102.6
		55025 ROCK COUNTY	11.1	3.0	34.2	6.3	0.19	5.7	96.2
		55030 SOUTHEASTERN CONSORTIUM	10.2	-2.1	34.6	5.6	0.31	5.5	91.5
		55035 WINNEFOND LAKE CONSORTIUM	10.2	0.0	38.9	5.0	0.16	4.8	99.9
		55040 WISCONSIN NORTHWEST CEP	9.6	-5.7	26.6	7.7	0.02	10.2	96.6
		55045 WOM CONSORTIUM	14.3	3.0	32.9	4.1	0.37	2.6	80.8
		55050 LAKE MICHIGAN CONSORTIUM	10.2	-1.6	40.4	6.3	0.12	4.2	96.4
		55055 SOUTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	9.9	-1.7	35.2	6.3	0.08	5.5	93.1
		55060 CENTRAL WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	10.3	-1.1	24.8	6.6	0.05	7.1	97.8
		55065 WEST CENTRAL WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	10.0	-2.6	23.2	5.8	0.05	8.1	91.8
		55070 NORTH CENTRAL WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	9.5	-2.9	23.9	6.5	0.02	8.4	98.8
		55075 NORTHEAST WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	12.6	2.3	30.1	5.8	0.07	6.4	100.2
		55080 SOUTHWEST WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	10.8	0.6	22.8	5.4	0.04	8.4	91.1
		55085 WESTERN WISCONSIN CONSORTIUM	10.9	1.2	23.6	5.8	0.04	8.0	101.1

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
6	ARKANSAS	12.7	-3.5	25.6	7.6	0.05	14.9	100.3
05005	LITTLE ROCK CITY IN PULASKI COUNTY	15.2	-2.1	12.4	6.4	1.87	10.1	164.1
05010	CENTRAL ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	14.4	-2.5	15.4	7.1	0.09	10.4	68.2
05020	NORTH CENTRAL ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	10.6	-3.4	29.2	9.9	0.03	17.5	94.1
05025	NORTHWEST ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	12.1	-7.4	32.8	4.8	0.05	12.1	102.9
05030	WEST CENTRAL ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	10.5	-0.9	28.2	8.7	0.04	13.2	97.0
05035	WESTERN ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	11.5	-3.0	38.8	6.6	0.05	13.7	108.3
05040	SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	10.6	-5.3	40.3	7.8	0.03	16.0	99.4
05045	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	10.8	-7.7	32.9	8.7	0.03	18.5	100.7
05050	NORTHEAST ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	10.6	-5.0	36.3	8.7	0.05	16.9	99.7
05055	EASTERN ARKANSAS CONSORTIUM	11.1	-5.6	24.5	14.2	0.05	26.7	90.9

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (CY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
6	LOUISIANA	22005 EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH	13.0	-7.3	16.0	10.8	0.10	15.1	100.2
		22010 CALCASIEU CONSORTIUM	13.3	-4.7	8.4	8.0	0.86	11.7	104.3
		22015 JEFFERSON PARISH	11.9	-9.8	21.1	12.4	0.07	10.8	106.3
		22020 LAFAYETTE PARISH	14.2	-6.4	10.8	8.6	1.38	7.8	81.7
		22025 ORLEANS PARISH	13.0	-10.6	19.7	10.0	0.64	10.0	112.9
		22030 OUACHITA PARISH	14.6	-4.4	10.8	9.9	2.79	21.8	129.1
		22035 RAPIDES PARISH	13.0	-5.8	14.7	9.9	0.23	16.2	101.8
		22040 SHREVEPORT CITY IN BOSSIER, CADD0 PARISH	11.2	-6.8	9.1	9.5	0.10	15.4	101.6
		22045 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 1 CONSORTIUM	13.9	-5.3	18.8	10.1	2.44	13.8	123.9
		22050 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 2 CONSORTIUM	11.5	-8.3	15.9	10.1	0.10	9.5	78.0
		22060 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 4 CONSORTIUM	11.1	-6.8	20.0	13.0	0.08	17.9	92.0
		22065 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 5 CONSORTIUM	11.5	-14.3	24.6	15.4	0.08	17.4	95.0
		22070 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 6 CONSORTIUM	9.6	-9.0	13.3	10.3	0.04	16.0	94.2
		22075 LOUISIANA PLANNING DISTRICT 7 CONSORTIUM	9.4	-8.6	21.4	14.7	0.03	22.2	81.3
		22085 TERREBONNE CONSORTIUM	12.8	-6.7	19.8	10.3	0.05	15.5	84.1
		22090 SAINT CHARLES CONSORTIUM	12.1	-15.2	21.9	13.5	0.07	11.9	91.4
		22095 MADISON PARISH CONSORTIUM	12.4	-16.4	34.5	11.4	0.14	12.6	126.3
		22100 UNION PARISH CONSORTIUM	10.2	-10.5	22.5	14.2	0.03	27.1	91.7
			10.9	-3.7	26.3	15.5	0.04	23.9	84.3

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
6	NEW MEXICO		12.1	-3.3	12.2	8.7	0.01	14.0	100.0
35005	ALBUQUERQUE CITY/BERNALILLO COUNTY		13.7	-2.8	9.5	6.2	0.41	10.1	103.9
35015	NAVAJO NATION		12.1	-4.2	13.4	13.3	0.01	22.7	105.8
35020	BALANCE OF NEW MEXICO CONSORTIUM		10.8	-4.3	14.2	9.7	0.01	15.8	97.8

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
6	OKLAHOMA	12.8	-7.9	19.4	6.6	0.05	10.3	98.9
40005	NORTHWEST OKLAHOMA SDA	10.5	-8.3	17.8	5.2	0.01	8.2	97.5
40010	NORTH CENTRAL OKLAHOMA SDA	11.3	-9.4	22.7	5.4	0.02	7.6	103.2
40015	SOUTHWEST OKLAHOMA SDA	10.3	-5.7	16.6	6.0	0.02	13.4	100.2
40020	SOUTH CENTRAL OKLAHOMA SDA	10.3	-6.1	18.0	6.5	0.04	12.2	92.9
40025	CLEVELAND COUNTY SDA(LESS OKLAHOMA CITY)	10.4	-8.3	8.3	5.0	0.31	6.0	59.8
40030	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA SDA	14.1	-9.2	15.9	5.5	0.31	8.1	113.8
40035	TULSA SDA	14.9	-7.3	22.4	7.3	0.17	7.5	108.7
40040	EAST CENTRAL OKLAHOMA SDA	9.6	-7.8	18.3	7.3	0.05	11.8	85.4
40045	SOUTHERN OKLAHOMA SDA	10.6	-8.2	24.9	6.8	0.03	14.2	95.5
40050	NORTHEAST OKLAHOMA SDA	12.9	-1.6	26.1	7.6	0.05	9.6	88.3
40055	EASTERN OKLAHOMA SDA	10.5	-5.6	21.2	7.8	0.06	15.4	80.5
40060	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA SDA	9.8	-9.0	21.2	9.0	0.02	17.8	90.8

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- TURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
6	TEXAS		16.2	-3.8	18.5	7.7	0.06	11.1	100.1
		48005 ALAMO CONSORTIUM	13.3	-3.3	10.9	7.7	0.13	14.5	99.2
		48010 CAMERON COUNTY	10.5	-9.9	17.2	14.3	0.28	26.0	100.4
		48015 BALANCE OF CAPITAL AREA CONSORTIUM	10.9	-3.4	16.0	6.3	0.04	11.4	75.5
		48020 AUSTIN CITY/TRAVIS COUNTY CONSORTIUM	13.9	-4.9	11.5	6.5	0.56	8.9	110.4
		48025 CENTRAL TEXAS CONSORTIUM	11.1	-4.1	13.8	7.6	0.04	13.6	108.6
		48030 BALANCE OF COASTAL BEND CONSORTIUM	10.1	-10.2	19.9	10.6	0.02	16.6	90.7
		48035 CORPUS CHRISTI/NUECES COUNTY	12.3	-14.2	16.8	10.4	0.36	13.4	106.0
		48040 DALLAS CITY IN DALLAS, COLLIN, DENTON COUNTIES	20.2	0.4	18.5	7.1	3.03	10.8	147.1
		48045 BALANCE OF DALLAS COUNTY CONSORTIUM	20.2	0.4	18.5	5.0	1.51	4.3	77.8
		48050 EAST TEXAS CONSORTIUM	13.1	-4.2	26.1	8.4	0.07	11.2	95.4
		48055 UPPER RIO GRANDE CONSORTIUM	12.9	-2.9	20.7	10.7	0.03	18.2	98.8
		48060 FORT WORTH CONSORTIUM	15.4	0.2	24.5	7.4	2.09	8.3	109.9
		48065 NORTH CENTRAL TEXAS CONSORTIUM	12.5	-2.1	23.6	6.1	0.09	7.5	69.9
		48070 GULF COAST CONSORTIUM	12.4	-7.5	20.4	8.4	0.10	8.3	79.5
		48075 BALANCE OF HARRIS COUNTY LESS HOUSTON CITY PAR	17.7	-6.0	15.6	6.9	0.92	4.6	59.9
		48080 HIDALGO/WILLACY CONSORTIUM	10.6	-9.7	24.3	17.7	0.18	29.1	97.5
		48085 HOUSTON CITY IN	17.7	-6.0	15.6	8.5	3.02	10.0	130.7
		48090 NORTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM	11.5	-9.3	22.2	6.5	0.02	9.9	100.5
		48095 PERMIAN BASIN CONSORTIUM	13.8	-10.1	27.0	7.9	0.02	9.9	99.6
		48100 HEART OF TEXAS CONSORTIUM	12.1	-5.5	19.5	7.5	0.05	12.6	98.5

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
6	TEXAS	16.2	-3.8	18.5	7.7	0.06	11.1	100.1
48105	SOUTHEAST TEXAS CONSORTIUM	12.2	-9.5	21.1	11.4	0.17	9.7	101.6
48110	LUBBOCK CITY/GARZA COUNTY CONSORTIUM	14.0	-7.1	10.1	5.9	0.13	10.0	100.6
48115	SOUTH PLAINS CONSORTIUM	12.0	-3.1	25.9	5.9	0.01	17.3	99.2
48120	BALANCE OF TARRANT COUNTY LESS	15.4	0.2	24.5	5.5	0.68	4.2	56.2
48125	NORTH EAST TEXAS CONSORTIUM	11.9	-4.2	32.8	8.8	0.04	13.2	105.3
48130	TEXAS PANHANDLE CONSORTIUM	13.1	-5.6	24.3	5.9	0.02	9.1	100.7
48135	SOUTH TEXAS CONSORTIUM	9.8	-9.4	12.8	19.4	0.03	31.5	100.0
48140	WEST CENTRAL TEXAS CONSORTIUM	11.7	-9.1	20.6	7.1	0.02	10.7	99.9
48145	CONCHO VALLEY CONSORTIUM	11.4	-4.0	19.3	5.9	0.01	10.7	101.2
48150	BRAZOS VALLEY CONSORTIUM	11.7	-6.8	14.0	6.0	0.04	13.8	100.5
48155	DEEP EAST TEXAS CONSORTIUM	11.4	-11.2	26.2	8.6	0.03	14.3	92.1
48160	GOLDEN CRESCENT CONSORTIUM	11.1	-10.9	23.6	7.4	0.03	12.6	98.4
48165	TEXOMA CONSORTIUM	11.5	-7.2	31.1	7.4	0.06	8.5	99.4
48170	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSORTIUM	9.7	-8.4	18.5	17.2	0.01	28.5	96.5

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
7	IOWA		11.9	-1.7	20.6	4.9	0.05	7.5	99.7
		19005 IOWA 1 CONSORTIUM (ALLAMAKEE-WINNESHIK)	10.2	-2.7	20.5	5.7	0.03	10.1	96.5
		19010 IOWA 2 CONSORTIUM (CERRO GORDO-NORTH)	10.6	-7.3	26.6	5.1	0.03	7.2	99.2
		19015 IOWA 3 CONSORTIUM (BUENA VISTA-SIOUX)	10.5	-2.3	20.2	3.9	0.03	7.7	98.9
		19020 IOWA 4 CONSORTIUM (CHEROKEE-WOODBURY)	11.4	-3.7	15.8	5.4	0.05	9.6	101.9
		19025 IOWA 5 CONSORTIUM (CALHOUN-WRIGHT)	11.3	-1.9	21.2	4.4	0.03	7.5	99.9
		19030 IOWA 6 CONSORTIUM (HARDIN-TAMA)	10.6	-3.2	24.9	5.0	0.04	7.3	101.0
		19035 IOWA 7 CONSORTIUM (BLACKHAWK-GRUNDY)	11.0	-4.0	22.9	6.3	0.07	7.0	99.9
		19040 DELAWARE/DUBUQUE CONSORTIUM	10.9	-4.1	30.6	5.7	0.09	6.9	112.2
		19045 IOWA 9 CONSORTIUM (CEDAR-SCOTT)	12.2	-2.1	25.8	6.4	0.10	6.5	96.8
		19050 IOWA 10 CONSORTIUM (BENTON-WASHINGTON)	11.6	-3.4	21.9	3.6	0.09	6.1	101.6
		19055 CENTRAL IOWA CONSORTIUM	14.0	1.0	14.0	3.7	0.12	6.2	101.8
		19060 IOWA 12 CONSORTIUM (AUDUBON-SAC)	11.2	-2.0	18.0	5.2	0.02	9.2	97.1
		19065 IOWA 13 CONSORTIUM (CASS-SHELBY)	10.6	-2.9	14.1	5.2	0.04	8.7	86.4
		19070 IOWA 14 CONSORTIUM (ADAIR-UNION)	9.6	-1.4	21.3	5.1	0.02	13.6	96.4
		19075 IOWA 15 CONSORTIUM (APPANOOSE-WAYNE)	11.4	-2.7	20.8	6.5	0.03	10.7	96.9
		19080 IOWA 16 CONSORTIUM (DES MOINES-LOUISA)	11.1	0.2	32.9	6.6	0.07	6.7	106.6

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME -----		AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO -----
7	KANSAS	13.6	-0.1	20.1	4.6	0.03	7.4	98.4
2005	KANSAS 1 CONSORTIUM (BARBER-WICHITA)	11.9	-4.0	20.0	4.0	0.01	7.9	99.3
2010	KANSAS 2 CONSORTIUM (ATCHISON-WASHINGTON)	11.4	-2.2	12.8	4.5	0.05	8.3	98.3
2015	KANSAS 3 CONSORTIUM (JOHNSON-WYANDOTTE)	17.1	2.9	15.4	4.5	0.51	5.9	94.0
2020	KANSAS 4 CONSORTIUM (BUTLER-SUMNER)	13.9	-2.8	28.5	4.8	0.08	6.5	101.4
2025	KANSAS 5 CONSORTIUM (ALLEN-WOODSON)	9.8	-5.3	26.4	5.9	0.03	8.9	98.8



REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
7	MISSOURI	14.1	-1.1	19.9	5.7	0.07	9.1	102.6
29005	MISSOURI 1 CONSORTIUM (ANDREW-WORTH)	10.4	-5.3	21.0	5.5	0.03	10.6	97.0
29010	MISSOURI 2 CONSORTIUM (ADAIR-WARREN)	9.9	-6.2	23.3	6.1	0.03	10.1	89.8
29015	MISSOURI 4 CONSORTIUM (BATES-VERNON)	9.6	-1.9	22.2	6.1	0.03	10.8	94.0
29020	MISSOURI 5 CONSORTIUM (AUDRAIN-OSAGE)	11.2	-1.6	12.5	4.1	0.06	6.7	102.7
29025	MISSOURI 6 CONSORTIUM (ST. LOUIS CITY)	17.6	-0.4	18.5	8.5	6.94	16.6	249.7
29030	MISSOURI 7 CONSORTIUM (BARRY-NEWTON)	11.0	-6.3	34.7	5.0	0.05	11.2	98.4
29035	MISSOURI 8 CONSORTIUM (CHRISTIAN-WEBSTER)	12.5	-2.4	19.4	5.3	0.08	10.1	100.6
29040	MISSOURI 9 CONSORTIUM (CAMDEN-WASHINGTON)	9.6	-4.8	21.7	6.9	0.03	12.8	90.3
29045	MISSOURI 10 CONSORTIUM (BUTLER-WRIGHT)	9.7	-2.9	29.7	8.0	0.02	19.7	97.5
29050	MISSOURI 15 (JEFFERSON/FRANKLIN CONSORTIUM)	10.6	-8.1	27.1	7.3	0.15	6.0	55.5
29055	MISSOURI 3 (KANSAS CITY CONSORTIUM)	15.2	-0.8	16.3	5.6	0.30	7.7	120.8
29060	MISSOURI 12 (BALANCE OF JACKSON CO.)	15.3	-0.6	16.0	4.9	0.66	4.4	53.2
29065	MISSOURI 14 (ST. CHARLES CO)	12.4	4.2	22.6	5.6	0.33	3.4	57.3
29070	MISSOURI 13 (ST. LOUIS CO)	16.2	2.2	22.0	4.5	1.96	3.5	86.4
29075	MISSOURI 11 CONSORTIUM (BOLLINGER-STODDARD)	10.5	-3.1	26.3	6.7	0.05	14.4	96.6

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
7	NEBRASKA		12.0	-4.2	15.2	4.2	0.02	8.0	101.9
31005	GREATER LINCOLN CONSORTIUM		10.9	-6.0	13.2	3.3	0.14	5.6	100.3
31010	GREATER OMAHA CONSORTIUM		14.3	-2.7	11.8	4.4	0.55	6.6	108.7
31015	GREATER NEBRASKA CONSORTIUM		10.3	-6.3	19.6	4.4	0.01	9.4	98.7

best copy available

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
8	COLORADO	14.6	-2.7	16.1	7.1	0.03	7.3	99.9
08005	ADAMS COUNTY	15.9	-3.3	16.1	8.1	0.23	6.0	67.6
08010	ARAPAHOE/DOUGLAS CONSORTIUM	15.7	0.1	10.0	5.4	0.26	3.2	77.0
08015	BOULDER COUNTY	12.2	0.7	29.1	5.3	0.29	5.0	95.3
08020	COLORADO SPRINGS CITY/EL PASO COUNTY	12.7	2.3	16.8	8.1	0.18	8.1	100.5
08025	DENVER CITY/COUNTY	19.4	0.0	11.4	7.2	4.55	10.3	164.3
08030	JEFFERSON COUNTY CONSORTIUM	12.8	-7.7	25.2	5.9	0.33	3.3	66.0
08035	LARIMER COUNTY	10.7	-1.8	21.2	6.6	0.07	5.9	95.8
08040	PUEBLO/UPPER ARKANSAS VALLEY CONSORTIUM	10.4	-5.3	12.3	9.8	0.02	10.1	96.3
08045	WELD COUNTY	12.1	-3.4	26.3	7.6	0.03	10.0	88.7
08050	RURAL COLORADO CONSORTIUM	11.3	-1.3	12.2	8.4	0.01	10.3	100.6

REGION STATE ----- SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
8 MONTANA	11.4	-7.4	11.1	7.2	0.01	9.2	100.0
30005 BUTTE RURAL CEP	10.6	-8.9	9.6	7.0	0.01	7.5	100.1
30010 BALANCE OF MONTANA CONSORTIUM	11.5	-7.1	11.4	7.2	0.01	9.5	100.1

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)		REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CYS4-CY87)		PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING		UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)		POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)		PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)		EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO	
8	NORTH DAKOTA		12.1		-5.7		9.1		4.6		0.01		9.8		102.8	
38005	NORTH DAKOTA CONSORTIUM		12.1		-5.7		9.1		4.6		0.01		9.8		102.9	

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
8	SOUTH DAKOTA		11.0	-3.4	13.5	3.8	0.01	13.1	99.4
46005	SOUTH DAKOTA CONSORTIUM		11.0	-3.4	13.5	3.8	0.01	13.1	99.5

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
8	UTAH		12.8	-5.2	16.9	5.7	0.02	7.7	99.8
49005	DAVIS COUNTY EMPLOYMENT & TRNG		11.7	-6.4	12.8	4.9	0.60	5.1	85.8
49010	MOUNTAINLAND ASSOC. OF GOVERNMENT		9.7	-1.6	15.6	5.9	0.05	9.8	93.0
49015	HASATCH FRONT SOUTH		14.7	-5.0	15.2	5.2	0.10	6.9	107.0
49020	WEBER/MORGAN CONSORTIUM		11.0	-4.2	17.2	6.6	0.14	7.1	90.1
49025	BEAR RIVER ASSOC. OF GOVERNMENT		9.6	-3.7	40.5	4.1	0.01	7.6	97.7
49030	SIX COUNTY COMMISSIONER'S ORG		7.7	-6.8	19.1	9.1	0.00	10.3	97.7
49035	FIVE COUNTY ASSOC. OF GOVERNMENTS		9.2	-3.9	9.9	5.9	0.00	10.9	97.3
49040	UNITAH BASIN ASSOC. OF GOVERNMENTS		10.7	-18.7	17.6	10.5	0.00	10.4	98.7
49045	SOUTHEAST UTAH ASSOC OF GOVERNMENTS		9.8	-6.4	21.8	9.7	0.00	10.4	107.0

REGION STATE -----	SDA NUMBER & NAME -----	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO -----
8	WYOMING	11.9	-10.1	15.5	7.0	0.01	5.8	101.6
	56005 WYOMING CONSORTIUM	11.9	-10.1	15.5	7.0	0.01	5.8	101.6

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- TURE AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
9 ARIZONA	14.3	0.6	16.6	5.6	0.03	9.5	100.0
04005 COCHISE COUNTY	10.0	-1.6	8.6	8.1	0.02	11.8	98.9
04010 GILA/PINAL CONSORTIUM	11.0	-0.8	29.7	10.1	0.01	13.8	105.7
04015 BALANCE OF GRAHAM COUNTY LESS	10.2	-3.0	7.9	9.6	0.01	15.2	91.4
04020 GREENLEE COUNTY			65.3	10.0	0.00	6.8	121.6
04025 PHOENIX CITY IN MARICOPA COUNTY	15.2	1.0	16.6	5.0	2.38	8.1	111.0
04030 BALANCE OF PIMA COUNTY LESS	12.4	0.7	14.9	4.8	0.07	9.1	98.5
04035 BALANCE OF MARICOPA COUNTY LESS	15.2	1.0	16.6	4.6	0.11	6.9	87.1
04040 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	14.2	1.1	16.2	12.1	0.02	13.4	96.9
04045 BALANCE OF YUMA COUNTY LESS	12.0	-0.6	33.1	17.2	0.02	12.3	101.5
04060 APACHE COUNTY	9.6	-7.6	6.3	15.9	0.01	35.3	105.3
04065 COCONINO COUNTY	10.2	-4.2	8.7	8.1	0.00	15.2	101.8
04070 MOHAVE/LA PAZ CONSORTIUM	10.3	-4.4	18.5	6.9	0.01	8.7	91.2
04075 NAVAJO COUNTY	10.1	-4.8	16.7	12.3	0.01	24.1	102.4
04080 YAVAPAI COUNTY	10.5	-0.9	14.6	5.9	0.01	9.4	95.7
04085 NAVAJO NATION	10.2	-4.5	10.5	9.0	0.01	17.6	99.1
04090 TRIBAL CONSORTIUM	14.1	0.6	16.8	5.8	0.03	9.4	100.0

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- TURE AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
9	CALIFORNIA	18.1	3.4	22.8	5.3	0.17	8.7	99.7
06005	SANTA CLARA/NOVA CONSORTIUM	19.1	8.5	34.5	3.0	4.05	3.5	168.9
06010	VERDUGO CONSORTIUM	18.8	3.6	23.3	3.6	5.09	7.2	126.7
06015	LONG BEACH CITY IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY	18.8	3.6	23.3	5.1	7.00	10.7	100.2
06020	LOS ANGELES CITY IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY	18.8	3.6	23.3	6.0	7.00	13.0	115.9
06025	OAKLAND CITY IN ALAMEDA COUNTY	18.5	2.0	14.6	6.6	6.62	16.0	134.0
06030	PASADENA CONSORTIUM	18.8	3.6	23.3	4.5	4.38	8.1	123.4
06035	CARSON/LOMITA/TORRANCE CONSORTIUM	18.8	3.6	23.3	3.8	5.52	4.6	114.1
06040	SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES CONSORTIUM	18.8	3.6	23.3	4.4	7.00	5.8	68.4
06045	SOUTH BAY CONSORTIUM	18.8	3.6	23.3	4.4	7.00	8.3	95.5
06050	SAN FRANCISCO CITY/COUNTY	20.7	2.0	7.9	4.4	7.00	10.3	155.5
06055	RICHMOND CITY IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	16.3	3.7	13.6	7.6	2.32	14.9	124.2
06060	HUMBOLDT COUNTY	12.3	-1.6	18.6	7.4	0.03	9.4	101.8
06065	BUTTE COUNTY	11.5	0.7	16.3	8.0	0.10	9.5	98.5
06070	BAL. OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY LESS RICHMOND CITY	16.3	3.7	13.6	4.4	0.93	5.0	66.7
06075	INYO/KERN/MONO CONSORTIUM	13.1	-0.8	27.0	9.7	0.02	10.0	103.8
06080	BALANCE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY LESS	18.8	3.6	23.3	5.2	0.98	9.8	97.5
06085	MARIN COUNTY	16.5	6.7	7.8	3.1	0.43	4.9	72.4
06090	MERCED COUNTY	12.5	6.9	37.5	10.7	0.08	11.9	97.8
06095	MONTEREY COUNTY	14.0	6.4	28.2	8.3	0.10	8.9	99.9
06100	SAN MATEO COUNTY	19.7	0.5	13.2	2.9	1.37	4.5	84.9

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (C00) (CY 87)	REAL GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING (PY 87)	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
9	CALIFORNIA		18.1	5.4	22.8	5.3	0.17	8.7	99.7
		06105 SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	13.5	1.4	21.8	4.5	0.12	6.7	102.1
		06110 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	13.0	2.1	25.2	6.6	0.49	8.2	84.9
		06115 SOLANO COUNTY	13.7	-5.3	21.5	6.1	0.34	8.1	87.3
		06120 SONOMA COUNTY	14.4	3.0	19.1	4.7	0.21	7.1	87.3
		06125 STANISLAUS COUNTY	13.6	1.0	32.3	11.9	0.21	10.0	98.1
		06130 VENTURA COUNTY	14.2	5.4	22.3	5.3	0.33	6.1	77.9
		06135 SAN DIEGO COUNTY	14.3	6.1	16.1	4.4	0.52	8.4	95.7
		06145 RIVERSIDE COUNTY	13.6	4.4	19.6	6.4	0.12	8.8	90.5
		06150 SAN BERNARDINO CITY IN SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	13.7	5.4	15.8	6.2	2.51	13.8	154.4
		06155 BAL. OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY LESS SAN BERNARD	13.7	5.4	15.8	5.0	0.05	8.4	76.0
		06160 FRESNO CITY/COUNTY CONSORTIUM	14.6	1.0	30.1	10.6	0.10	11.4	182.3
		06165 TULARE COUNTY	12.3	-2.5	39.2	10.1	0.06	13.2	95.3
		06170 SACRAMENTO CITY/COUNTY CONSORTIUM	14.7	0.3	7.7	5.3	0.94	8.9	103.8
		06175 SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	14.6	0.6	25.7	9.8	0.31	10.8	100.4
		06180 BALANCE OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY LESS	19.1	8.5	34.5	4.7	0.85	6.0	76.1
		06185 BALANCE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY LESS OAKLAND CITY	18.5	2.0	14.6	4.1	1.25	5.7	86.1
		06190 SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	10.4	-0.2	12.2	4.3	0.06	8.0	94.4
		06195 IMPERIAL COUNTY	13.1	-1.2	37.7	22.1	0.03	12.7	99.5
		06200 GOLDEN SIERRA CONSORTIUM	12.0	-0.2	13.2	5.2	0.06	6.9	79.7
		06205 SHASTA COUNTY	13.4	-1.4	15.4	9.2	0.04	8.8	100.6
		06210 YOLO COUNTY	16.0	5.6	18.5	6.6	0.12	9.1	96.7
		06215 KINGS COUNTY	12.1	-7.7	37.4	9.8	0.06	12.4	99.0
		06220 NADERA COUNTY	12.3	-3.1	43.1	10.2	0.04	12.4	88.9
		06225 SAN BENITO COUNTY	13.3	11.9	47.6	12.9	0.02	10.8	88.1
		06230 NAPA COUNTY	13.2	4.1	19.5	4.6	0.14	6.0	87.9
		06235 MENDOCINO COUNTY	11.3	-3.1	29.0	8.3	0.02	9.5	99.5
		06240 MOTHER LODE CONSORTIUM	11.1	7.2	11.7	7.4	0.02	8.4	95.3
		06245 COLUSA-YUBA CONSORTIUM	12.1	-0.0	28.8	10.8	0.04	11.2	97.7
		06250 NORTEC CONSORTIUM	10.4	-2.5	23.4	9.8	0.01	9.8	96.9
		06255 BAL OF ORANGE CO. LESS SANTA ANA CITY	16.7	4.3	24.2	3.0	2.50	4.7	88.8
		06260 SANTA ANA CITY IN ORANGE CO.	16.7	4.3	24.2	4.1	7.00	10.1	132.5

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
9	HAWAII	13.2	3.5	8.5	3.5	0.17	7.8	98.2
15005	HONOLULU CITY/COUNTY	13.6	3.6	7.3	3.1	1.37	7.5	97.5
15010	HAWAII COUNTY	11.8	1.9	14.3	5.2	0.03	10.3	98.4
15015	MAUI/KALAWAO CONSORTIUM	12.4	9.3	12.5	4.0	0.08	7.6	101.7
15020	KAUAI COUNTY	10.7	2.0	11.3	4.1	0.07	6.9	105.2

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL- TURE AND MINING (CY84-CY87)	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
9	NEVADA	15.0	2.2	7.0	6.0	0.01	6.3	102.8
32005	NEVADA BUSINESS SERVICE, INC(NBS, INC)	14.6	0.0	4.1	6.3	0.01	6.8	101.7
32010	JOB OPPRTY IN NEVADA(JOIN)	15.5	5.4	11.4	5.6	0.01	5.6	104.4

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY85-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
10	ALASKA		17.7	-16.0	10.9	9.7	0.00	8.6	101.2
02005	ANCHORAGE/MATANUSKA-SUSITNA CONSORTIUM		19.0	-14.4	6.7	8.7	0.01	6.6	97.8
02010	FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH		16.2	-20.1	3.8	12.4	0.01	8.1	97.5
02015	BALANCE OF ALASKA CONSORTIUM		15.7	-16.0	19.5	10.1	0.00	11.6	107.1

REGION STATE SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANU- FACTURING, AGRICUL. AND MINING	UNEMPLOY- MENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (10005 PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/ RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
10 IDAHO	12.0	-2.3	21.1	7.3	0.01	9.6	99.2
16015 IDA-ORE CONSORTIUM	13.4	-0.7	20.1	6.4	0.02	9.2	98.3
16035 IDAHO BALANCE OF STATE SDA	11.2	-3.8	21.8	7.8	0.01	9.8	99.8

REGION	STATE	SDA NUMBER & NAME	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE(000) (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (CY 86) (10005 PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
10	OREGON		14.1	-3.5	22.5	5.9	0.03	7.7	101.7
41015	BAL.	OF CLACKAMAS COUNTY LESS PORTLAND CITY	16.1	-3.7	23.6	4.0	0.14	4.6	64.5
41020	JACKSON/JOSEPHINE	CONSORTIUM	12.0	-4.3	23.3	6.4	0.05	10.0	98.8
41030	MID WILLAMETTE VALLEY	CONSORTIUM	11.8	-4.0	23.1	6.0	0.12	8.1	95.1
41040	OREGON	CONSORTIUM	10.9	-5.1	29.2	7.4	0.01	8.7	99.4
41045	SOUTHERN WILLAMETTE		12.8	-2.5	22.3	5.6	0.06	8.5	99.1
41050	THE PIC		16.5	-2.3	18.1	5.2	0.73	6.6	117.7

REGION	STATE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EARNINGS IN RETAIL AND WHOLESALE TRADE (CY 87)	REAL THREE-YEAR GROWTH RATE IN EARNINGS IN RETAIL & WHOLESALE TRADE (CY84-CY87)	PERCENT OF EMPLOYMENT IN MANUFACTURING, AGRICULTURE AND MINING	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PY 87)	POPULATION DENSITY (1000S PER SQ. MILE, MAX. OF 7)	PERCENT FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL (CY 79)	EMPLOYEE/RESIDENT WORKER RATIO
SDA NUMBER & NAME								
10	WASHINGTON	14.2	-2.7	20.9	7.0	0.07	7.2	98.6
53005	SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM	11.8	-3.6	27.9	7.6	0.08	7.4	82.4
53010	OLYMPIC CONSORTIUM	10.6	-6.4	24.8	6.8	0.06	7.0	96.0
53015	PACIFIC MOUNTAIN CONSORTIUM	11.4	-5.1	18.7	8.5	0.05	8.0	96.9
53020	NORTHWEST WASHINGTON CONSORTIUM	11.0	-3.2	19.6	8.3	0.06	8.4	97.0
53025	SEATTLE CITY/KING COUNTY CONSORTIUM	17.0	-0.7	19.6	5.4	0.64	5.0	109.7
53030	SNOHOMISH COUNTY	12.4	-4.3	30.0	6.3	0.19	5.6	76.8
53035	SPOKANE CITY/COUNTY CONSORTIUM	13.6	-4.2	14.4	6.9	0.20	8.4	101.5
53040	TACOMA CITY/PIERCE COUNTY CONSORTIUM	13.3	-4.0	13.5	7.3	0.32	8.4	89.2
53045	PENTAD SDA	11.1	-5.1	27.6	10.7	0.01	10.3	99.5
53050	TRI-VALLEY CONSORTIUM	12.0	-3.5	30.6	11.6	0.03	11.4	96.8
53055	EASTERN JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP	10.3	-7.8	13.2	7.4	0.01	10.1	90.6
53060	BENTON/FRANKLIN/WALLA WALLA CONSORTIUM	11.3	-6.0	26.1	8.9	0.05	7.2	104.5

APPENDIX B

Attachment 2

STATE WELFARE RECIPIENT ENTERED
EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO AND
WELFARE RECIPIENT FOLLOW-UP
EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO

REGION	STATE	WELFARE RECIPIENT ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO	WELFARE RECIPIENT FOLLOW-UP EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO
1	CONNECTICUT	0.90	0.86
1	MAINE	0.92	0.83
1	MASSACHUSETTS	0.90	0.91
1	NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.81	0.86
1	RHODE ISLAND	0.90	1.06
1	VERMONT	0.89	0.78
2	NEW JERSEY	0.94	0.87
2	NEW YORK	0.84	0.84
3	DELAWARE	0.85	0.93
3	DISTRICT OF COL	0.98	0.65
3	MARYLAND	0.90	0.86
3	PENNSYLVANIA	0.88	0.84
3	VIRGINIA	0.87	0.90
3	WEST VIRGINIA	0.96	0.79
4	ALABAMA	0.85	0.76
4	FLORIDA	0.91	0.88
4	GEORGIA	0.87	0.77
4	KENTUCKY	0.84	0.73
4	MISSISSIPPI	0.88	0.78
4	NORTH CAROLINA	0.80	0.77
4	SOUTH CAROLINA	0.86	0.82
4	TENNESSEE	0.81	0.80

REGION	STATE	WELFARE RECIPIENT ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO	WELFARE RECIPIENT FOLLOW-UP EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO
		-----	-----
5	ILLINOIS	0.85	0.86
5	INDIANA	0.90	0.83
5	MICHIGAN	0.90	0.85
5	MINNESOTA	0.93	0.92
5	OHIO	0.83	0.80
5	WISCONSIN	0.93	0.89
6	ARKANSAS	0.80	0.80
6	LOUISIANA	0.85	0.76
6	NEW MEXICO	0.78	0.90
6	OKLAHOMA	0.82	0.84
6	TEXAS	0.93	0.86
7	IOWA	0.87	0.83
7	KANSAS	0.83	0.86
7	MISSOURI	0.87	0.83
7	NEBRASKA	0.86	0.85
8	COLORADO	0.83	0.86
8	MONTANA	0.90	0.96
8	NORTH DAKOTA	0.86	0.94
8	SOUTH DAKOTA	0.92	0.95
8	UTAH	0.84	0.94
8	WYOMING	0.90	0.83

REGION	STATE	WELFARE RECIPIENT ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO	WELFARE RECIPIENT FOLLOW-UP EMPLOYMENT RATE RATIO
9	ARIZONA	0.88	0.81
9	CALIFORNIA	0.88	0.83
9	HAWAII	0.85	0.87
9	NEVADA	0.83	0.81
10	ALASKA	0.90	0.83
10	IDAHO	0.89	0.96
10	OREGON	0.91	0.92
10	WASHINGTON	0.91	0.90

APPENDIX C

Attachment 1

COMPUTATION FORMULAS
FOR TITLE II-A AND III
PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Attachment 1

Computation Formulas for Title II-A
Performance Measures

The calculation formulas for each of the performance measures are shown below. The specific column and line items reflected in the formulas relate to the JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR) for Title II-A programs and the Worker Adjustment Annual Program Report (WAPR) for the newly revised Title III programs. PY 88-89 performance standards policy allows the Governor to determine whether 6% participants and funds are to be included in the calculation of performance standards and only actual performance; therefore, for these purposes the JASR line items below may be revised to reflect those instances where 6% activities are to be excluded. JASRs reflecting the data used for performance standards should be prepared and held for examination at the time of performance standards compliance reviews.

Title II-A Performance Measures

Adult

- ° Entered Employment Rate
Column (A) $\frac{\text{I.B.1} \times 100}{\text{I.B}}$
- ° Average Wage at Placement
Column (A) II.30
- ° Cost per Entered Employment
Column (A) $\frac{\text{II.31}}{\text{I.B.1}}$
- ° Welfare Entered Employment Rate
Column (B) $\frac{\text{I.B.1} \times 100}{\text{I.B}}$

Adult Postprogram

- ° Follow-up Employment Rate
Column (A) III.33

- ° Follow-up Weekly Earnings
Column (A) III.34
- ° Average Weeks Worked at Follow-up
Column (A) III.35
- ° Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate
Column (B) III.33

Youth

- ° Entered Employment Rate
Column (C) $\frac{I.B.1}{I.B} \times 100$
- ° Positive Termination Rate
Column (C) $\frac{(I.B.1) + (I.B.2)}{I.B} \times 100$
- ° Youth Employability Enhancement Rate
Column (C) $\frac{(I.B.1.a) + (I.B.2)}{I.B} \times 100$
- ° Cost Per Positive Termination
Column (C) $\frac{II.31}{(I.B.1) + (I.B.2)}$

Title III Performance Measures

Adult

- ° Entered Employment Rate
Column (B) $\frac{(I.C.1 + I.C.2)}{I.C. - I.C.3}$
- ° Average Wage at Placement
Line 26

APPENDIX C

Attachment 2

JTPA ANNUAL STATUS REPORT AND INSTRUCTIONS

JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR)

1. Purpose. The JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR) displays cumulative data on participation, termination, performance measures and the socio-economic characteristics of all terminees on an annual basis. The information will be used to determine levels of program service and performance measures. Selected information will be aggregated to provide quantitative program accomplishments on a local, State, and national basis.
2. General Instructions. The Governor will submit: 1) a combined Statewide JASR for Title III Formula and Discretionary National Reserve (Column D only) and 2) for Title II-A (Columns A-C) a separate JASR for each designated Service Delivery Area (SDA). (A Statewide summary of these SDA data need not be submitted.) Grantees may determine whether the reports are submitted on JASR forms or as a computer printout, with data, including signature and title, date signed and telephone number, arrayed as indicated on the JASR form. If revisions are made to the JASR data after the reporting deadline, revised copies of the JASR should be submitted to DOL as soon as possible according to the required reporting procedures.

NOTE: For JASR reporting purposes, Title II-A shall refer to programs operated with funds authorized under Section 202(a) of the Act or otherwise distributed by the Governor under Section 202(b)(3) (six percent) of the Act--incentive grants for service to the hard-to-serve and programs exceeding performance standards. (Concentrated Employment Programs (CEPs) should report total Title II-A program expenditures of 78% funds, special supplemental allocations, and 6% incentive grants.) Do not include data on (six percent) funds authorized under Section 202(b)(3) for technical assistance. Participants and expenditures under Title I, Sections 123 (8%) and 124 (3%), and expenditures under Title II, Section 202 (b)(4) (five percent) and any participants, if applicable, are likewise excluded from the JASR.

NOTE: Participant and expenditure information under Title II-B, Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYETP), is also excluded from the JASR.

SDAs should not terminate from Title II-A youths who participate in the Title II-B Summer Program unless they are not expected to return to Title II-A for further employment, training and/or services.

If these youths receive concurrent employment, training and/or services under both Titles II-A and II-B, they are to be considered participants in both titles for

purposes of recording actual number of weeks participated, dollars expended, and other pertinent data.

If, however, these youths do not receive Title II-A employment, training and/or services while participating in Title II-B, this period is not to be included in the calculation of actual number of weeks participated in Title II-A at Line 29, Column C.

The reporting period begins on the starting date of each JTPA program year, as stated in Section 161 of the Act. Reports are due in the national and regional offices no later than 45 days after the end of each program year. Two copies of the JASR are to be provided to:

Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
ATTN: TSVR -- Rm. S-5306
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20210

At the same time an additional copy of the JASR is to be provided to the appropriate Regional Administrator for Employment and Training in the DOL regional office that includes the State in which the JTPA recipient is located.

3. Facsimile of Form. See the following page.
4. Instructions for Completing the JTPA Annual Status Report (JASR).

a. State/SDA Name, Number and Address

Enter the name and address of the State agency that will administer the grant recipient's program (Title III report). Enter the name, ETA assigned SDA number and address of the designated SDA subrecipient, as appropriate (Title II-A report).

b. Report Period

Enter in "From" the beginning date of the designated JTPA program year and enter in "To" the ending date of that program year.

c. Signature and Title (at bottom of the page)

The authorized official signs here and enters his/her title.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Employment and Training Administration JTPA ANNUAL STATUS REPORT	a. STATE/SDA NAME AND ADDRESS	b. REPORT PERIOD	
		FROM	TO

I. PARTICIPATION AND TERMINATION SUMMARY		Total Adults	Adults (Welfare)	Youth	Dislocated Workers
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
A. TOTAL PARTICIPANTS					
B. TOTAL TERMINATIONS					
1. Entered Unsubsidized Employment					
a. Also Attained Any Youth Employability Enhancement					
2. Youth Employability Enhancement Terminations					
a. Attained PIC-Recognized Youth Employment Competencies					
b. Completed Program Objectives (14-15 year olds)					
3. All Other Terminations					
Line No.	II. TERMINEES PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION				
1	Sex	Male			
2		Female			
3	Age	14 - 15			
4		16 - 17			
5		18 - 21			
6		22 - 29			
7		30 - 54			
8		55 and over			
9	Education Status	School Dropout			
10		Student			
11		High School Graduate or Equivalent (No Post-High School)			
12		Post-High School Attendee			
13	Family Status	Single Head of Household With Dependent(s) Under Age 18			
14		White (Not Hispanic)			
15	Race/Ethnic Group	Black (Not Hispanic)			
16		Hispanic			
17		American Indian or Alaskan Native			
18		Asian or Pacific Islander			

c. SIGNATURE AND TITLE	d. DATE SIGNED	e. TELE. NO.
------------------------	----------------	--------------

a. STATE/SDA NAME AND ADDRESS	REPORT PERIOD
	FROM TO

Line No.	II. TERMINEES PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION - Continued	Total Adults	Adults (Welfare)	Youth	Dislocated Workers
		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)
19	Limited English Language Proficiency				
20	Handicapped				
21	Offender				
22	Reading Skills Below 7th Grade Level				
23	Long-Term AFDC Recipient				
24	Unemployment Compensation Claimant				
25	Unemployed: 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26 Weeks				
26	Not in Labor Force				
27	Welfare Grant Type: AFDC				
28	GA/RCA				
29	Average Weeks Participated				
30	Average Hourly Wage at Termination				
31	Total Program Costs (Federal Funds)				
32	Total Available Federal Funds				

III. FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION

33	Employment Rate (At Follow-up)				
34	Average Weekly Earnings of Employed (At Follow-up)				
35	Average Number of Weeks Worked in Follow-up Period				
36	Sample Size				
37	Response Rate				

IV. YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT INFORMATION

38	Attained Any Competency Area				
39	Pre-Employment/Work Maturity Skills				
40	Basic Education Skills				
41	Job Specific Skills				

REMARKS:

d. Date Signed

Enter the date the report was signed by the authorized official.

e. Telephone Number

Enter the area code and telephone number of the authorized official.

5. General Information. For purposes of the JASR, the Total Adults and Adults (Welfare) columns will include terminees age 22 years and older. Thus, the column breakouts are based strictly on age rather than on program strategy. The youth column will include terminees who were age 14-21 at the time of eligibility determination. The Dislocated Workers column may include adults and youth, as applicable.

Unless otherwise indicated, data reported on characteristics of terminees should be based on information collected at the time of eligibility determination.

CHARACTERISTICS INFORMATION OBTAINED ON AN INDIVIDUAL AT THE TIME OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION FOR THE RECIPIENT'S JTPA PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE UPDATED WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL TERMINATES FROM THE JTPA PROGRAM.

COLUMN HEADINGS

Column A Total Adults

This column will contain an entry for each appropriate item for all adult participants in Title II-A only.

Column B Adults (Welfare)

This column will contain an entry for each appropriate item for adult participants in Title II-A who were listed on the welfare grant and were receiving cash payments under AFDC (SSA Title IV), General Assistance (State or local government), or the Refugee Assistance Act of 1980 (PL 96-212) at the time of JTPA eligibility determination. For reporting and performance standards purposes, exclude those individuals who receive only SSI (SSA Title XVI) from entries in Column B.

NOTE: Column B is a sub-breakout of Column A; therefore, Column B should be less than or equal to Column A for each line entry.

Column C Youth

This column will contain an entry for each appropriate item for all participants, aged 14 - 21, in Title II-A only.

Column D Dislocated Workers

This column will contain an entry for each appropriate item for all participants in Title III Formula and Discretionary National Reserve who were determined to be eligible dislocated workers.

NOTE: Columns A, B, and C apply to Title II-A only. Column D applies to Title III only. All information regarding a given participant must be entered in the same column, e.g., Column C for a youth in Title II-A.

The sum of the entries (all SDAs in a State) in Columns A and C, Item I.A., Total Participants, of the JASR should equal the entry in Column A, Item III.A.1., SDA Participants, of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year. The entry in Column D, Item I.A. of the Statewide JASR for Title III should be the sum of the entries in Columns B and C, Item III.A. of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year for the same grant.

The sum of the entries (all SDAs in a State) in Columns A and C, Item I.B., Total Terminations, of the JASR should equal the entry in Column A, Item III.B.1., SDA Terminations, of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year. The entry in Column D, Item I.B. of the statewide JASR for Title III should be the sum of the entries in Columns B and C, Item III.B. of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year for the same grant.

SECTION I - PARTICIPATION AND TERMINATION SUMMARY

Section I displays the program's accomplishments in terms of the total cumulative number of participants in the program and the number and types of terminations from the program, as of the end of the reporting period.

Entries for Items I.A. and I.B. are cumulative from the beginning of the program year through the end of the reporting period.

Item I.A. Total Participants

Enter by column the total number of participants who are or were receiving employment, training or services (except post-termination services) funded under that program title through the end of the reporting period, including both those on board at the beginning of the designated program year and those who have entered during the program year. If individuals receive concurrent employment, training and/or services under more than one title, they are to be considered participants in both titles for purposes of recording actual number of weeks participated, dollars expended, and other pertinent data.

"Participant" means any individual who has: (1) been determined eligible for participation upon intake; and (2) started receiving employment, training, or services (except post-termination services) funded under the Act, following intake. Individuals who receive only outreach and/or intake and initial assessment services or postprogram follow-up are excluded.

Participants who have transferred from one title to another, or between programs of the same title, should be recorded as terminations from the title or program of initial participation and included as participants in the title or program into which they have transferred, unless they are to be considered concurrent participants in both titles or programs.

Item I.B. Total Terminations

Enter by column the total number of participants terminated after receiving employment, training, or services (except post-termination services) funded under that program title, for any reason, from the beginning of the program year through the end of the reporting period. This item is the sum of Items I.B.1. through I.B.3.

"Termination" means the separation of a participant from a given title of the Act who is no longer receiving employment, training, or services (except post-termination services) funded under that title. NOTE: Individuals may continue to be considered as participants for a single period of 90 days after last receipt of employment and/or training funded under a given title. During the 90-day period, individuals may or may not have received services. For purposes of calculating average weeks participated, this period between "last receipt of employment and/or training funded under a given title" and actual date of termination is defined as "inactive status" and is not to be included in Line 29.

Individuals who initially participate in Title III Formula funded activity and subsequently participate in Title III Discretionary National Reserve funded activity (and conversely), FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIALLY DETERMINED TRAINING OBJECTIVE, may be considered to be concurrent participants in both Title III programs. The type of termination determined for the subsequent program also should be recorded for the initial program for such participants.

For purposes of calculating average weeks participated for such concurrent Title III program participants, the period between "last receipt of employment and/or training funded under a given Title III program" (i.e., Formula or Discretionary National Reserve) and actual date of termination from that Title III program is defined as "inactive status" and is not to be included in Line 29.

Item I.B.1. Entered Unsubsidized Employment

Enter by column the total number of participants who, at termination, entered full- or part-time unsubsidized employment through the end of the reporting period. Unsubsidized employment means employment not financed from funds provided under the Act and includes, for JTPA reporting purposes, entry into the Armed Forces, entry into employment in a registered apprenticeship program, and terminees who became self-employed.

Item I.B.1.a. Also Attained Any Youth Employability Enhancement

Enter the total number of youth who (1) entered unsubsidized employment, Item I.B.1., and (2) also attained any one of the five youth employability enhancements (as enumerated in the instructions for Item I.B.2. below and defined in Appendix C). This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.B.1.

Item I.B.2. Youth Employability Enhancement Terminations

Enter the total number of youth who were terminated under one of the Youth Employability Enhancements through the end of the report period. "Youth Employability Enhancement" means an outcome for youth, other than entered unsubsidized employment, which is recognized as enhancing long-term employability and contributing to the potential for a long-term increase in earnings and employment. Outcomes which meet this requirement shall be restricted to the following: (1) **Attained PIC-Recognized Youth Employment Competencies (two or more);** (2) **Entered Non-Title II Training;** (3) **Returned to Full-Time School;** (4) **Completed Major Level of Education;** or (5) **Completed Program Objectives (14-15 year olds).**

NOTE: For reporting purposes, a youth shall not be counted in Item I.B.2. if s/he entered unsubsidized employment, and shall be counted in only one of the five categories enumerated above, even though more than one outcome may have been achieved.

Item I.B.2.a. Attained PIC-Recognized Youth Employment Competencies

Enter the total number of youth who, at termination, have demonstrated proficiency as defined by the PIC in **two or more** of the following three skill areas in which the **terminee was deficient at enrollment:** pre-employment/work maturity, basic education, or job-specific skills. Competency gains must be achieved through program participation and be tracked through sufficiently developed systems that must include: quantifiable learning objectives, related curricula/training modules, pre- and post-assessment, employability planning, documentation, and certification. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.B.2. **During PY '88, competency attainment in one skill area will meet this definition.**

NOTE: Terminees who have attained a competency in basic education skills and/or job specific skills through training funded under 8% programs and/or cooperative agreements may be counted in Item I.B.2.a. provided such training was for completion of a training objective initially determined while in a youth employment competency system operated under 78% funds.

Appendix B defines the minimal structural and procedural elements of a sufficiently developed youth employment competency system as well as the minimal requirements for ensuring consistency in the reporting of competency attainment in the pre-employment/work maturity skill area.

Item I.B.2.b. Completed Program Objectives (14-15 year olds)

Enter the total number of youth (ages 14 and 15 only) who, at termination, had completed a program objective. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.B.2.

NOTE: For Column C, (1) Item I.B.2.b. cannot be greater than Item II.3., (2) the sum of Items I.B.2.a. and I.B.2.b. cannot be greater than Item I.B.2. and (3) Item I.B.1. plus Item I.B.2. plus Item I.B.3. must equal Item I.B.

Item I.B.3. All Other Terminations

Enter by column the total number of participants who were terminated for reasons other than those in Items I.B.1. and I.B.2., successful or otherwise, through the end of the reporting period. Include intertitle transfers here. See notes at Item I.B.

SECTION II - TERMINEE PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION

Section II displays performance measures/parameters information. As indicated previously, data reported on characteristics of terminees should be based on information collected at time of eligibility determination unless otherwise indicated.

Governors may develop any participant record which meets the requirements of Section 629.35(c) and (d) of the JTPA regulations. The DOL/ETA Technical Assistance Guide: The JTPA Participant Record, dated May 1983, may be used as a reference.

Line Item Definitions and Instructions

Sex

Line 1 Male
Line 2 Female

Distribute the terminees by column according to Sex. The sum of Lines 1 and 2 in each column should equal Item I.B. in that column.

Age

Line 3 14-15
Line 4 16-17
Line 5 18-21
Line 6 22-29
Line 7 30-54
Line 8 55 and over

Distribute the terminees by column according to Age. The sum of Lines 3 through 8 in each column should equal Item I.B. in that column.

Education Status

Line 9 School Dropout
Line 10 Student
Line 11 High School Graduate or Equivalent (No Post-High School)
Line 12 Post-High School Attendee

Distribute the terminees by column according to Education Status. The sum of Lines 9 through 12 in each column should equal Item I.B. in that column.

Family Status

Line 13 Single Head of Household with Dependent(s) Under Age 18.

Enter the total number of terminees by column for whom the above Family Status classification applies.

Race/Ethnic Group

Line 14 White (Not Hispanic)
Line 15 Black (Not Hispanic)
Line 16 Hispanic
Line 17 American Indian or Alaskan Native
Line 18 Asian or Pacific Islander

Distribute the terminees by column according to the Race/Ethnic Groups listed above. For purposes of this report, Hawaiian Natives are to be recorded as "Asian or Pacific Islander". The sum of Lines 14 through 18 in each column should equal Item I.B. in that column.

Other Barriers to Employment

Line 19 Limited English Language Proficiency
Line 20 Handicapped
Line 21 Offender
Line 22 Reading Skills Below 7th Grade Level
Line 23 Long-Term AFDC Recipient

Enter the total number of terminees by column for whom each of the above Other Barriers to Employment apply.

U. C. Status

Line 24 Unemployment Compensation Claimant

Enter the total number of terminees by column for whom the above Unemployment Compensation Status classification applies.

Labor Force Status

Line 25 Unemployed: 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26 Weeks
Line 26 Not in Labor Force

Enter the total number of terminees by column for whom each of the above Labor Force Status classifications apply.

Welfare Grant Information

Line 27 Welfare Grant Type: AFDC
Line 28 GA/RCA

Distribute by column the total number of adult and youth welfare terminees who, at eligibility determination, were receiving (or whose family was receiving) cash payments under AFDC (SSA Title IV), GA, General Assistance (State or local government) or RCA (Refugee Cash Assistance) under the Refugee Assistance Act of 1960 (PL 96-212). If a welfare recipient terminee (or his/her family) received AFDC cash payments, include such terminee on Line 27. A welfare recipient terminee (or his/her family) who received cash payments under GA and/or RCA, but not AFDC, should be included on Line 28. The sum of Lines 27 and 28 in Column B, Adults (Welfare), should equal Item I.B. in that column. The sum of Lines 27 and 28 in Column C, Youth, should be the same as or less than Item I.B. in that column.

Other Program Information

Line 29 Average Weeks Participated

Enter by column the average number of weeks of participation in the program for all terminees. Weeks of participation include the period from the date an individual becomes a participant in a given title through the date of a participant's last receipt of

employment and/or training funded under that title. Exclude the single period of up to 90 days during which an individual may remain in an inactive status prior to termination. Time in inactive status for all terminees should not be counted toward the actual number of weeks participated. Inactive status is defined as that period between "last receipt of employment and/or training funded under a given title" and actual date of termination. See note at Item I.B.

To calculate this entry: Count the number of days participated for each terminee, including weekends, from the start date of his/her participation in the title until his/her last receipt of employment and/or training under that title. For those who receive services only, use date of last receipt of such services. Divide this result by 7. This will give the number of weeks participated for that terminee. Sum all the terminees' weeks of participation and divide the result by the number of terminees, as entered (by column) in Item I.B. This entry should be reported to the nearest whole week.

Line 30 Average Hourly Wage at Termination

Enter by column the average hourly wage at termination for the total number of terminees in Item I.B.1.

To calculate this entry: Sum the hourly wage at termination for all the terminees shown in Item I.B.1. Divide the result by the number of terminees shown in Item I.B.1.

Hourly wage includes any bonuses, tips, gratuities and commissions earned.

Line 31 Total Program Costs (Federal Funds)

Enter the total accrued expenditures, through the end of the reporting period, of the funds allocated to SDAs under Section 202 (a) of the Act or otherwise distributed by the Governor to SDAs under Section 202(b)(3) -- incentive grants for services to the hard-to-serve and programs exceeding performance standards -- for Title II-A programs in Columns A and C (includes costs of services to participants aged 14-21), as appropriate, for all participants served. Do not include expenditures of funds authorized under Section 202(b)(3) for technical assistance. Exclude expenditures under Title I, Sections 123 (8%) and 124 (3%) and Title II Section 202(b)(4) (5%). Enter the total accrued expenditures of Title III funds received by the Governor under Section 301 of the Act in Column D only, for all Title III participants served through the end of the reporting period. Include expenditures of Federal funds only, both Formula and Discretionary National Reserve.

NOTE: Entries will be made to the nearest dollar. Negative entries are not acceptable. The JASR program cost data will be compiled on an accrual basis. If the recipient's accounting

records are not normally maintained on an accrual basis, the accrual information should be developed through an analysis of the records on hand or on the basis of best estimates.

The sum of the entries in Columns A and C, Line 31, Total Program Costs, of the JASR (i.e., total for the State's SDAs under Title II-A) should equal the entry in Column A, Item I.A.1., SDA Total Program Expenditures, of the JSSR, and the sum of the entries (all SDAs in a State) in Column C, Line 31 of the JASR should equal the entry in Column A, Item II. of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year. The entry in Column D, Line 31, of the Statewide JASR for Title III should be the sum of the entries in Columns B and C, Item I.A. of the JSSR, for the same recipient, that includes the final quarter of the same program year for the same grant.

Line 32 Total Available Federal Funds

Enter the total Federal funds available for the Title II-A or Title III program described on this report including (1) unexpended funds carried over from previous program years, (2) funds allocated or awarded for this program year, and (3) any reallocation that increased or decreased the amount of funds available for expenditure through the end of this reporting period. Enter all Title II-A funds (Adults and Youth) in Column A and all Title III funds in Column D. Title II-A funds include those allocated to the SDA by the Governor under Section 202(a) of the Act, as well as incentive grants for services to the hard-to-serve and for programs exceeding performance standards under Section 202(b)(3). Exclude funds authorized under Section 202(b)(3) (6%) for technical assistance to SDAs and funds received for activities under Sections 123 (8%) and 124 (3%) and Section 202(b)(4) (5%). Title III funds include all Formula amounts under Section 301(b) and all Discretionary National Reserve awards under Section 301(a).

SECTION III - FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION

Section III displays information based on follow-up data which must be collected through participant contact to determine an individual's labor force status and earnings, if any, during the 13th full calendar week after termination and the number of weeks s/he was employed during the 13-week period. Follow-up data should be collected from participants whose 13th full calendar week after termination ends during the program year (the follow-up group). Thus, follow-up will be conducted for individuals who terminate during the first three quarters of the program year and the last quarter of the previous program year.

Follow-up data will be collected for the following terminees: Title II-A adults, adult welfare recipients, and Title III dislocated workers (Columns A, B, and D). No follow-up information is required for Title II-A youth (Column C).

The procedures used to collect the follow-up data are at the discretion of the Governors. However, in order to ensure consistency of data collection and to guarantee the quality of the follow-up information, follow-up procedures must satisfy certain criteria. (See the Follow-up Guidelines included in these JASR instructions, Appendix A.)

NOTE: Every precaution must be taken to prevent a "response bias" which could arise because it may be easier to contact participants who were employed at termination than those who were not and because those who entered employment at termination are more likely to be employed at follow-up. Special procedures have been developed by which SDAs and States can monitor response bias. If your response rates for those who were and were not employed at termination differ by more than 5 percentage points, the follow-up entries for the JASR must be calculated using the "Worksheet for Adjusting Follow-up Performance Measures" in the Follow-up Technical Assistance Guide. If the response rates differ by 5 percentage points or less, the following instructions for completing Lines 33-35 may be used.

Line 33 Employment Rate (At Follow-up)

Enter by column the employment rate at follow-up.

Calculate the employment rate by dividing the total number of respondents who were employed (full-time or part-time) during the 13th full calendar week after termination by the total number of respondents (i.e., terminees who completed follow-up interviews). Then multiply the result by 100. This entry should be reported to the nearest one decimal (00.0).

Line 34 Average Weekly Earnings of Employed (At Follow-up)

Enter by column the average weekly earnings of those employed (full-time or part-time) at follow-up.

Calculate the (before-tax) average weekly earnings by multiplying the hourly wage by the number of reported hours for each respondent employed at follow-up; and, if appropriate, add tips, overtime, bonuses, etc. Divide the sum of weekly earnings for all respondents employed during the 13th full calendar week after termination by the number of respondents employed at the time of follow-up. Respondents not employed at follow-up are not included in this average. This entry should be reported to the nearest whole dollar.

Weekly earnings include any wages, bonuses, tips, gratuities, commissions and overtime pay earned.

Line 35 Average Number of Weeks Worked in Follow-up Period

Enter by column the average number of weeks worked.

To calculate the average number of weeks worked (full-time or part-time), divide the sum of the number of weeks worked during the 13 full calendar weeks after termination for all respondents who worked, by the total number of all respondents, **whether or not they worked any time** during this 13-week follow-up period. **This entry should be reported to the nearest one decimal (00.0).**

Line 36 Sample Size

Enter by column the size of the actual sample selected to be contacted for follow-up. (For Title III **only**, a statewide sample of dislocated workers must be selected. For Title II-A, i.e., total adults and adult welfare recipients, SDA samples must be selected.)

NOTE: If oversampling was used, the sample size should include all those selected, not just the required minimum sample size. Those deceased or severely incapacitated to the point of being unable to respond at follow-up may be excluded from the sample size.

Line 37 Response Rate

Enter by column the overall response rate, i.e., the percentage of complete surveys obtained.

To calculate the overall response rate, divide the number of terminees with complete follow-up information by the total number of terminees included in the follow-up sample (Line 36) and multiply by 100. **This entry should be reported to the nearest whole percent.**

NOTE: Complete follow-up information consists of substantive answers to the required follow-up questions and may not include "don't know", "no answer" or "don't remember".

SECTION IV - YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT INFORMATION

Section IV displays information relevant to youth employment competency attainment as **defined by the PIC**. **Regardless of termination type**, the following data represent the total cumulative number of individuals that attained a youth employment competency in any of the three skill areas and the numbers of individuals who attained a competency in (1) pre-employment/work maturity, (2) basic education and/or (3) job specific skills.

NOTE: Terminees who have attained a competency in **basic education skills and/or job specific skills** through training funded under **8% programs and/or cooperative agreements** may be counted in Section IV provided such training was for completion of a training objective initially determined while in a youth employment competency system operated under **78% funds**.

Appendix B defines the minimal structural and procedural elements of a sufficiently developed youth employment competency system as well as the minimal requirements for ensuring consistency in the reporting of competency attainment in the pre-employment/work maturity skill area.

Line 38 Attained Any Competency Area

Enter in Column C the total unduplicated number of youth terminees who were enrolled in a youth employment competency component and who attained a competency in at least one skill area.

NOTE: Lines 39-41 are not sub-breakouts of Line 38 because one individual may attain several competencies and may be recorded on more than one of Lines 39-41. That individual may be recorded only once on Line 38, thus, Lines 39-41 need not sum to Line 38.

Line 39 Pre-Employment/Work Maturity Skills

Enter in Column C the number of youth terminees who attained a competency in the pre-employment/work maturity skill area.

Line 40 Basic Education Skills

Enter in Column C the number of youth terminees who attained a competency in the basic education skill area.

Line 41 Job Specific Skills

Enter in Column C the number of youth terminees who attained a competency in the job specific skill area.

NOTE: An entry of "0" on any of Lines 39-41 may indicate that the PIC has determined that a specific skill area is not necessary to become employment competent in their local labor market.

Appendix A

Follow-up Guidelines

To ensure consistent data collection and as accurate information as possible, procedures used to obtain follow-up information must satisfy the following criteria:

- ° Participant contact should be conducted by telephone or in person. Mail questionnaires may be used in those cases where an individual does not have a telephone or cannot be reached.
- ° Participant contact must occur as soon as possible after the 13th full calendar week after termination but no later than the 17th calendar week after termination.
- ° Data reported are to reflect the individual's labor force status and earnings during the 13th full calendar week after termination and the number of weeks s/he was employed throughout the 13-week period after termination.
- ° Interview questions developed by DOL (see following Exhibit) must be used to determine the follow-up information reported on the JASR. Respondents must be told that responding is voluntary and that information provided by them will be kept confidential. Other questions may be included in the interview. Attitudinal questions may precede DOL questions, but questions related to employment and earnings must follow.

EXHIBIT

Minimum Postprogram Data Collection Questions

- A. I want to ask you about the week starting on Sunday, _____, and ending on Saturday, _____, which was (last week/two/three/four weeks ago).
1. Did you do any work for pay during that week?
_____ Yes [Go to 2]
_____ No [Go to C]
 2. How many hours did you work in that week?
_____ Hours
 3. How much did you get paid per hour in that week?
_____ Dollars per hour
 4. How much extra, if any, did you earn in that week from tips, overtime, bonuses, commissions, or any work you did on the side, before deductions?
_____ Dollars
- B. Now I want to ask you about the entire 13 weeks from Sunday, _____, to Saturday, _____.
5. Including the week we just talked about, how many weeks did you work at all for pay during the 13-week period?
_____ Weeks [Go to end]

ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

- C. If answered "NO" to Question 1:
- Now I want to ask you about the entire 13 weeks from Sunday, _____, to Saturday, _____.
6. Did you do any work for pay during that 13-week period?
_____ Yes [Go to 7]
_____ No [Go to end]
 7. How many weeks did you do any work at all for pay during that 13-week period?

- ° Attempts must be made to contact all individuals unless terminnee populations are large enough to use sampling.
- ° At least six attempts may need to be made to contact enough individuals in the follow-up group to obtain the required response rate.
- ° For each SDA (Title II-A) or combined Statewide (Title III Formula and National Reserve) report (JASR), minimum response rates of 70% are required for each of the following six groups: among adults, those who entered employment at termination and those who did not enter employment at termination; among welfare recipients, those who entered employment at termination and those who did not enter employment at termination; and among dislocated workers, those who entered employment at termination and those who did not enter employment at termination. The response rate is calculated as the number of terminees with complete follow-up information divided by the total number of terminees included in the group eligible for follow-up.

Sampling Procedures

Where sampling is used to obtain participant contact information, it is necessary to have a system which ensures consistent random selection of sample participants from all terminees in the group requiring follow-up.

- ° No participant in the follow-up group may be arbitrarily excluded from the sample.
- ° Procedures used to select the sample must conform to generally accepted statistical practice, e.g., a table of random numbers or other random selection techniques must be used.
- ° The sample selected for contact must meet minimum sample size requirements indicated in Table 1.

The use of sampling will depend on whether the terminnee populations are large enough to provide estimates which meet minimum statistical standards. If the number of terminees for whom follow-up is required is less than 138, sampling cannot be used. In such cases attempts must be made to contact all the appropriate terminees.

Minimum Sample Sizes for Follow-up

To determine the minimum number of terminees to be included in the follow-up sample, refer to Table 1 in the following instructions. Find the row in the left-hand column that contains

the planned number of terminees for each of the groups requiring follow-up: adults, welfare recipients and dislocated workers. The required minimum sample size is given in the middle column of that row. The last column gives sampling percentages that will assure that the minimum sample size is obtained.

NOTE: The welfare recipients in the adult sample may be used as part of the welfare sample. In this case, an additional number of welfare recipients must be randomly selected to provide a supplemental sample large enough to meet the same accuracy requirements as other groups requiring follow-up. To determine the minimum size of this supplemental welfare sample, find the row in the left-hand column of Table 1 that contains the planned total number of welfare recipients requiring follow-up. From the corresponding entry in the middle column, subtract the number of welfare recipients included in the adult sample. The remainder represents the minimum size of the supplemental sample of welfare recipients required for contact.

-19-
Table 1

MINIMUM SAMPLE SIZES FOR FOLLOW-UP

<u>Number of Terminees in Follow-up Population</u>	<u>Minimum Sample Size</u>	<u>Sampling Percentages</u>
1 - 137	All	100
138 - 149	137	94
150 - 159	143	92
160 - 169	149	89
170 - 179	154	87
180 - 189	159	85
190 - 199	164	84
200 - 224	175	82
225 - 249	185	78
250 - 274	194	74
275 - 299	202	71
300 - 349	217	67
350 - 399	229	62
400 - 449	240	57
450 - 499	250	53
500 - 599	265	50
600 - 749	282	44
750 - 999	302	38
1,000 - 1,499	325	30
1,500 - 1,999	338	22
2,000 - 2,999	352	17
3,000 - 4,999	364	12
5,000 or more	383	7.3

Correcting for Differences in Response Rates

Different response rates for those terminees who entered employment at termination and those who did not are expected to bias the performance estimates because those who entered employment at termination are more likely to be employed at follow-up. It is assumed that those who were employed at termination are easier to locate than those who were unemployed because the interviewer has more contact sources (e.g., name of employer). The resulting response bias can artificially inflate performance results at follow-up.

To account for this problem, separate response rates should be calculated for those who were employed at termination and for those who were not. These separate response rates should be calculated for three groups: all adult II-A terminees, welfare recipients and Title III terminees.

For each group, if the response rates of those employed at termination and those not employed differ by more than 5 percentage points, then the "Worksheet for Adjusting Follow-up Performance Measures" in the Follow-up Technical Assistance Guide must be used to correct the follow-up measures for that group.

Appendix B

PIC-RECOGNIZED YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCIES

A. General Description of Youth Employment Competency Skill Areas

- ° Pre-employment skills include world of work awareness, labor market knowledge, occupational information, values clarification and personal understanding, career planning and decision making, and job search techniques (resumes, interviews, applications, and follow-up letters). They also encompass survival/daily living skills such as using the phone, telling time, shopping, renting an apartment, opening a bank account, and using public transportation; and
Work maturity skills include positive work habits, attitudes, and behavior such as punctuality, regular attendance, presenting a neat appearance, getting along and working well with others, exhibiting good conduct, following instructions and completing tasks, accepting constructive criticism from supervisors and co-workers, showing initiative and reliability, and assuming the responsibilities involved in maintaining a job. This category also entails developing motivation and adaptability, obtaining effective coping and problem-solving skills, and acquiring an improved self image.
- ° Basic education skills include reading comprehension, math computation, writing, speaking, listening, problem solving, reasoning, and the capacity to use these skills in the workplace.
- ° Job-specific skills -- Primary job-specific skills encompass the proficiency to perform actual tasks and technical functions required by certain occupational fields at entry, intermediate or advanced levels. Secondary job-specific skills entail familiarity with and use of set-up procedures, safety measures, work-related terminology, recordkeeping and paperwork formats, tools, equipment and materials, and breakdown and clean-up routines.

B. Sufficiently Developed Systems for Youth Employment Competencies

A sufficiently developed youth employment competency system must include the following **structural and procedural elements**:

1. Quantifiable Learning Objectives

- ° PIC-recognized competency statements that are quantifiable, employment-related, measurable, verifiable learning objectives that specify the proficiency to be achieved as a result of program participation.

Employment competencies/quantifiable learning objectives approved by the PIC as relevant to the SDA must include a description of the skills/knowledge/attitudes/behavior to be taught, the levels of achievement to be attained, and the means of measurement to be used to demonstrate competency accomplishment. The level of achievement selected should enhance the youth's employability and opportunities for postprogram employment.

2. Related Curricula, Training Modules, and Approaches

- ° Focused curricula, training modules, or behavior modification approaches which teach the employment competencies in which youth are found to be deficient.

Such related activities, components, or courses must encompass participant orientation, work-site supervisor/instructor/community volunteer training, and staff development endeavors as appropriate. They also must include, as appropriate, relevant agreements, manuals, implementation packages, instructions, and guidelines. A minimum duration of training must be specified which allows sufficient time for a youth to achieve those skills necessary to attain his/her learning objectives.

3. Pre-Assessment

- ° Assessment of participant employment competency needs at the start of the program to determine if youth require assistance and are capable of benefitting from available services.

A minimum level of need must be established before a participant is eligible to be tracked as a potential "attained PIC-recognized youth employment competency" outcome. All assessment techniques must be objective, unbiased and conform to widely accepted measurement criteria. Measurement methods used must contain clearly defined criteria, be field tested for utility, consistency, and accuracy, and provide for the training/preparation of all raters/scorers.

4. Post-Assessment (Evaluation)

- Evaluation of participant achievement at the end of the program to determine if competency-based learning gains took place during project enrollment.

Intermediate checking to track progress is encouraged. All evaluation techniques must be objective, unbiased and conform to widely accepted evaluation criteria. Measurement methods used must contain clearly defined criteria, be field tested for utility, consistency, and accuracy, and provide for the training/preparation of all raters/scorers.

5. Employability Development Planning

- Use of assessment results in assigning a youth to appropriate learning activities/sites in the proper sequence to promote participant growth and development, remedy identified deficiencies, and build upon strengths.

6. Documentation

- Maintenance of participant records and necessary reporting of competency-based outcomes to document intra-program learning gains achieved by youth.

7. Certification

- Proof of youth employment competency attainment in the form of a certificate for participants who achieve predetermined levels of proficiency to use as evidence of this accomplishment and to assist them in entering the labor market.

C. Guidelines for Ensuring Consistency in the Reporting of
Pre-Employment/Work Maturity Skill Competencies

Individuals should demonstrate proficiency in each of the following 11 core competencies. In order for an attainment to be reported in the area of pre-employment/work maturity, at least one PIC-certified competency statement must be developed/quantified in each of the following 11 core competencies -- **provided that at least 5 of these learning objectives were achieved during program intervention:**

1. Making Career Decisions
2. Using Labor Market Information
3. Preparing Resumes
4. Filling Out Applications
5. Interviewing
6. Being Consistently Punctual
7. Maintaining Regular Attendance
8. Demonstrating Positive Attitudes/Behavior
9. Presenting Appropriate Appearance
10. Exhibiting Good Interpersonal Relations
11. Completing Tasks Effectively

Appendix C

Definitions of Terms Necessary for Completion of Reports

EMPLOYMENT/TRAINING SERVICES

ASSESSMENT -- services are designed to initially determine each participant's employability, aptitudes, abilities and interests, through interviews, testing and counseling to achieve the applicant's employment related goals.

FOLLOW-UP -- is the collection of information on a terminee's employment situation at a specified period after termination from the program.

INTAKE -- includes the screening of an applicant for eligibility and: (1) a determination of whether the program can benefit the individual; (2) an identification of the employment and training activities and services which would be appropriate for that individual; (3) a determination of the availability of an appropriate employment and training activity; (4) a decision on selection for participation and (5) the dissemination of information on the program.

OUTREACH -- activity involves the collection, publication and dissemination of information on program services directed toward economically disadvantaged and other individuals eligible to receive JTPA training and support services.

YOUTH EMPLOYABILITY ENHANCEMENT TERMINATION

An outcome for youth, other than entered unsubsidized employment, which is recognized as enhancing long-term employability and contributing to the potential for long-term increase in earnings and employment. The five youth employability enhancement outcomes are:

(1) Demonstrated proficiency in youth employment competencies as defined by the PIC in two or more of the following three skill areas in which the terminee was deficient at enrollment: pre-employment/work maturity, basic education, or job-specific skills. During PY '88, competency attainment in one skill area will meet the definition.

(2) Entered an occupational-skills employment/training program, not funded under Title II of the JTPA, which builds upon and does not duplicate training received under Title II.

(3) Returned to full-time school if, at time of intake, the participant was not attending school and had not obtained a high school diploma or equivalent.

(4) Completed, during enrollment, a level of educational achievement which had not been reached at entry. Levels of educational attainment are elementary, secondary, and post-secondary. Completion standards shall be governed by State standards or, at the Governor's discretion, local standards at the elementary level; shall include a high school diploma, GED Certificate or equivalent at the secondary level, and shall require a diploma or other written certification of completion at the post-secondary level. NOTE: To obtain credit, completion of a major level of education must result primarily from participation in a JTPA activity.

(5) Completed program objectives as defined in approved exemplary youth project plans if, at time of entry, the participant was 14 or 15 years of age.

EDUCATION STATUS

SCHOOL DROPOUT -- An adult or youth (aged 14-21) who is not attending school full-time and has not received a high school diploma or a GED certificate.

STUDENT -- An adult or youth (aged 14-21) who has not received a high school diploma or GED certificate and is **enrolled full-time in an elementary, secondary or postsecondary-level vocational, technical, or academic school** or is between school terms and intends to return to school.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR EQUIVALENT (No Post-High School) -- An adult or youth (aged 14-21) who has received a high school diploma or GED Certificate, but who has not attended any postsecondary vocational, technical, or academic school.

POST HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDEE -- An adult or youth (aged 14-21) who has received a high school diploma or GED certificate and **has attended (or is attending)** any postsecondary-level vocational, technical, or academic school.

FAMILY STATUS

SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD -- A single, abandoned, separated, divorced or widowed individual who has responsibility for one or more dependent children under age 18.

RACE/ETHNIC GROUP

WHITE (NOT HISPANIC) -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

BLACK (NOT HISPANIC) -- A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

HISPANIC -- A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin (including Spain), regardless of race. NOTE: Among persons from Central and South American countries, only those who are of Spanish origin, descent, or culture should be included in the Hispanic category. Persons from Brazil, Guiana, and Trinidad, for example, would be classified according to their race, and would not necessarily be included in the Hispanic category. Also, the Portugese should be excluded from the Hispanic category and should be classified according to their race.

AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent (e.g., India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan), or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa. Hawaiian natives are to be recorded as Asian or Pacific Islanders.

OTHER BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY -- Inability of an applicant, whose native language is not English, to communicate in English, resulting in a job handicap.

HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUAL -- Refer to Sec. 4(10) of the Act. Any individual who has a physical or mental disability which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment. NOTE: This definition will be used for performance standards purposes, but is not required to be used for program eligibility determination (Sec. 4(8)(E)).

OFFENDER -- For reporting purposes, the term "offender" is defined as any adult or youth who requires assistance in overcoming barriers to employment resulting from a record of arrest or conviction (excluding misdemeanors).

READING SKILLS BELOW 7th GRADE LEVEL -- An adult or youth assessed as having English reading skills below the 7th grade level on a generally accepted standardized test.

LONG-TERM AFDC RECIPIENT -- An adult or youth welfare recipient who had received (or whose family had received) cash payments under AFDC (SSA Title IV) for any 24 or more of the 30 months prior to eligibility determination.

U.C. STATUS

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CLAIMANT -- Any individual who has filed a claim and has been determined monetarily eligible for benefit payments under one or more State or Federal unemployment compensation programs, and who has not exhausted benefit rights or whose benefit year has not ended.

LABOR FORCE STATUS

EMPLOYED -- (a) An individual who, during the 7 consecutive days prior to application to a JTPA program, did any work at all: (i) as a paid employee; (ii) in his or her own business, profession or farm, or (iii) worked 15 hours or more as an unpaid worker in an enterprise operated by a member of the family; or (b) an individual who was not working, but has a job or business from which he or she was temporarily absent because of illness, bad weather, vacation, labor-management dispute, or personal reasons, whether or not paid by the employer for time off, and whether or not seeking another job. (This term includes members of the Armed Forces on active duty, who have not been discharged or separated; participants in registered apprenticeship programs; and self-employed individuals.)

EMPLOYED PART-TIME -- An individual who is regularly scheduled for work less than 30 hours per week.

UNEMPLOYED -- An individual who did not work during the 7 consecutive days prior to application for a JTPA program, who made specific efforts to find a job within the past 4 weeks prior to application, and who was available for work during the 7 consecutive days prior to application (except for temporary illness).

UNEMPLOYED: 15 OR MORE WEEKS OF PRIOR 26 WEEKS -- An individual who is unemployed (refer to definition above) at the time of eligibility determination and has been unemployed for any 15 or more of the 26 weeks immediately prior to such determination, has made specific efforts to find a job throughout the period of unemployment, and is not classified as "Not in Labor Force".

NOT IN LABOR FORCE -- A civilian 14 years of age or over who did not work during the 7 consecutive days prior to application for a JTPA program and is not classified as employed or unemployed.

WELFARE GRANT INFORMATION

WELFARE RECIPIENT -- An individual who receives (or whose family receives) cash payments under AFDC (SSA Title IV), General Assistance (State or local government), or the Refugee Assistance Act of 1980 (PL 96-212) at the time of JTPA eligibility determination. For reporting and performance standards purposes, exclude those individuals who receive only SSI (SSA Title XVI).

PROGRAM COSTS

ACCRUED EXPENDITURES -- The allowable charges incurred during the program year to date requiring provision of funds for: (1) goods and other tangible property received; and (2) costs of services performed by employees, contractors, subrecipients, and other payees.

NOTE: These charges do not include "resources on order", i.e., amounts for contracts, purchase orders and other obligations for which goods and/or services have not been received.

APPENDIX C

Attachment 3

**WORKER ADJUSTMENT ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT
AND INSTRUCTIONS**

WORKER ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT (ETA 9019)

1. Purpose. The Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA) Annual Program Report (WAPR) displays cumulative data on participation, termination, performance measures and the socio-economic characteristics of all terminees on an annual basis. The information will be used to determine levels of program service and performance measures. Selected information will be aggregated to provide quantitative program accomplishments on a local, State, and national basis.

General Instructions. The Governor will submit: (1) a separate WAPR for each designated Substate Area (SSA) (a Statewide summary of these SSA data need not be submitted); (2) a separate WAPR covering participants and terminees in statewide, regional or industrywide projects funded under Section 302(c)(1)(B) of the Act; and (3) a separate WAPR covering participants and terminees in projects funded under Secretary's National Reserve Grants (Section 302(a)(2)). Recipients may determine whether the reports are submitted on WAPR forms or as a computer printout, with data, including signature and title, date signed and telephone number, arrayed as indicated on the WAPR form. If revisions are made to the WAPR data after the reporting deadline, revised copies of the WAPR should be submitted to DOL as soon as possible according to the required reporting procedures. If these revisions affect data reported on the WQFR, then that revised document should also be submitted.

NOTE: For WAPR reporting purposes, EDWAA shall refer to: (1) programs operated by Substate grantees with funds authorized under Sections 302(c)(2) and 302(d) or otherwise distributed by the Governor under Section 302(c)(1)(E) and (2) projects operated by the Governor with funds authorized under Sections 302(c)(1) and 302(a)(2) of the Act.

The reporting period begins on the starting date of each Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program year, as stated in Section 161 of the JTPA. Reports are due in the National and Regional Offices no later than 45 days after the end of each program year. Two copies of the WAPR are to be provided to:

U.S. Department of Labor, ETA
ATTN: TSVR -- Room S-5306
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20210

At the same time an additional copy of the WAPR is to be provided to the appropriate Regional Administrator for Employment and Training in the DOL Regional Office that includes the State in which the JTPA recipient is located.

NOTE: The current JASR, ETA 8580 (June 1988), is to continue to be used for programs operating solely with PY88 and earlier year's Title III funds. The WAPR is to be used beginning July 1, 1989, for PY89 programs funded under EDWAA (including carryin funds used for EDWAA purposes, if any).

Facsimile of Form. See the following page.

Instructions for Completing the Worker Adjustment Program Annual Program Report (WAPR).

a. State/Substate Area Name and Address

On separate Section 302(c)(1) and Section 302(a)(2) reports, enter the name and address of the State agency that will administer the Statewide programs. For SSA reports, enter the name and address of the Substate grantee that will administer the SSA programs.

b. Report Type

Designate the type of report data provided on this WAPR. If this is an SSA report, also enter the ETA-assigned Substate Area Code number.

c. Report Period

Enter in "From" the beginning date of the designated JTPA program year and enter in "To" the ending date of that program year.

d. Signature and Title (at bottom of the page)

The authorized official signs here and enters his/her title.

e. Date Signed

Enter the date the report was signed by the authorized official.

f. Telephone Number

Enter the area code and telephone number of the authorized official.

Worker Adjustment Program
Annual Program Report (WAPR)

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration



a. State/Substate Area Name and Address

b. Report Type

- () SSA # _____
() Gov Statewide
() Secy N/Resv

OMB No. 1205-0274
Expires 12/31/92

c. Report Period

From: 7/1/19 ____

To: 6/30/19 ____

I. PARTICIPATION AND TERMINATION SUMMARY		A. Concurrent Participants	B. All Participants
A. Issued Certificate of Continuing Eligibility (CCE)			
B. TOTAL PARTICIPANTS			
1. All CCEs Redeemed for Retraining			
C. TOTAL TERMINATIONS			
1. Entered Unsubsidized Employment From Retraining			
a. Relocated Out of Area			
2. Entered Unsubsidized Employment From Basic Readjustment Services ONLY			
3. Called Back/Remained with the Layoff Employer			
4. Transferred to Other JTPA Programs			
5. Entered Non-JTPA Training			
6. All Other Terminations			

II. TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY

All Terminees

Line No.			
1	Sex	Male	
2		Female	
3	Age	29 and Under	
4		30 - 44	
5		45 - 54	
6		55 and over	
7	Education Status	Less Than High School	
8		H.S. Graduate or Equivalent (No Post-High School)	
9		Post-High School Attendee	
10		College Graduate and Above	
11	Family Stat.	Single Head of Household With Dependent(s) Under Age 18	
12	Race/Ethnic Group	White (Not Hispanic)	
13		Black (Not Hispanic)	
14		Hispanic	
15		American Indian or Alaskan Native	
16		Asian or Pacific Islander	
17	Other Barriers to Employment	Limited English Language Proficiency	
18		Handicapped	
19		Reading Skills Below 7th-Grade Level	

d. Signature and Title

e. Date Signed

f. Telephone No.

a. State/Substate Area Name and Address

Report Period

From 7/1/19 To 6/30/19

Line No.	II. TERMINEE CHARACTERISTICS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY - CONTINUED		All Terminees
20	Ber- letis Stat.	U.C. Claimant	
21	Lab For Stat.	Unemployed: 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26 Weeks	
22	Veterans Status	Veteran (Total)	
23		Vietnam-Era	
24	Average Weeks Participated		
25	Average Hourly Wage - Pre-Program		
26	Average Hourly Wage at Termination		
27	Total Program Costs (Federal Funds)		
28	Needs-Related Payments		
29	Total Available Federal Funds		
III. FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION			
30	Employment Rate at Follow-up		
31	Average Hourly Wage at Follow-up		
32	Average Number of Weeks Worked in Follow-up Period		
33	Sample Size		
34	Response Rate		
IV. RETRAINING/BASIC READJUSTMENT SERVICES			
35	Received Basic Readjustment Services ONLY		
36	Received ANY Retraining Activity		
37	Less than 26 Weeks		
38	26 or More Weeks		
39	Completed Classroom Training: Basic Education or Attained GED		
40	Completed On-the-Job Training		
41	Completed Other Occupational Skills Training		

Remarks:

5. General Information. Unless otherwise indicated, data reported on characteristics of terminees should be based on information collected at the time of eligibility determination.

CHARACTERISTICS INFORMATION OBTAINED ON AN INDIVIDUAL AT THE TIME OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION FOR THE RECIPIENT'S EDWAA PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE UPDATED WHEN THE INDIVIDUAL TERMINATES FROM THE EDWAA PROGRAM.

NOTE: Recipients shall ensure that individuals are enrolled within 45 days of the date of application or a new application must be taken (20 CFR 629.1). This 45-day period for Certificate of Continuing Eligibility (CCE) holders should begin upon completion of a full participant record, usually at the time of CCE redemption, as this may be at a location other than where the CCE was issued and such information taken earlier to determine eligibility may not be readily available at the redemption site.

SECTION I - PARTICIPATION AND TERMINATION SUMMARY

Section I displays the EDWAA program's accomplishments in terms of the total cumulative number of participants in the program, the number and types of terminations from the program, and the number of CCEs issued/redeemed, as of the end of the reporting period.

In Section I, Column A., Item I.B., enter individuals who are concurrent participants and are receiving Basic Readjustment Services and/or Retraining under another EDWAA-funded grantee/program, JTPA title or have entered non-JTPA/EDWAA training for the completion of the initially determined training objective, prior to termination from their initial EDWAA program. Column A. is a sub-breakout of Column B. for this line item.

In Section I, Column A., Item I.C., enter terminees who have been concurrent participants and have received Basic Readjustment Services and/or Retraining under another EDWAA-funded grantee/program, JTPA title or have received non-JTPA/EDWAA training for the completion of the initially determined training objective, prior to termination from their initial EDWAA program. Also, distribute these terminees between Items I.C.1. and I.C.2., as appropriate, on the basis of the final type of termination from the EDWAA program of final participation. Column A. is a sub-breakout of Column B. for these line items. NOTE: An individual included in a line item entry in Column A. also must be included in the entry for the same line item in Column B.

Entries for Items I.A, I.B. and I.C. are cumulative from the beginning of the program year through the end of the reporting period.

Item I.A. Issued Certificate of Continuing Eligibility (CCE)

Enter the total number of applicants to whom a Certificate of Continuing Eligibility was issued during this program year, as provided in Section 316(b) of the Act, by the Substate grantee through the end of the reporting period. NOTE: Enter zero for this item on the Governor's Statewide report (Section 302(c)(1)).

Item I.B. Total Participants

Enter by column the total number of participants who are or were receiving employment, training or services (except post-termination services) through the end of the reporting period, including both those on board at the beginning of the designated program year and those who have entered during the program year.

"Participant" means any individual who has: (1) been determined eligible for participation upon intake; and (2) started receiving employment, training, or services (except post-termination services) funded under the Act, following intake. Individuals who receive only outreach and/or intake and initial assessment services or postprogram follow-up are excluded.

NOTE: Also exclude individuals who receive only Rapid Response Assistance and information, per Section 314(b), provided by the State's Dislocated Worker Unit.

If individuals receive concurrent employment, training and/or services under more than one title/program, they are to be considered participants in both titles/programs for purposes of recording actual number of weeks participated, dollars expended, and other pertinent data. Individuals who initially participate in EDWAA funded activity and subsequently participate in any other EDWAA (or non-EDWAA) funded activity, FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIALLY DETERMINED TRAINING OBJECTIVE, may be considered to be concurrent participants in each program.

The sum of the entries (all SSAs in a State) in Item I.B., Total Participants, and in Item I.C., Total Terminations, of the WAPR should equal the entries for Substate Grantees in Column B., Lines 16 and 17, respectively, of the WQFR for the final quarter of the same program year for the same recipient.

The entries in Item I.B. and in Item I.C. of the Governor's Statewide WAPR should equal the entries for Governor's Reserve in Column A., Lines 16 and 17, respectively, of the WQFR for the final quarter of the same program year for the same recipient.

The entries in Item I.B. and in Item I.C. of the Secretary's National Reserve WAPR should equal the entries for the Secretary's National Reserve in Column C., Lines 16 and 17, respectively of the WQFR, for the final quarter of the same program year for the same recipient.

Item I.B.1. All CCEs Redeemed for Retraining

Enter the total number of unexpired participant CCEs, regardless of year issued, redeemed for Retraining during this program year by the Substate grantee, through the end of the reporting period. Include all CCEs so redeemed that were issued by any Substate grantee for periods not to exceed 104 weeks prior to redemption. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.B.

Item I.C. Total Terminations

Enter by column the total number of participants who terminated (as defined below) from the program during the reporting period. Include all participants who received no Basic Readjustment Services (except supportive services and/or counseling) or Retraining for 90 days. **This item is the sum of Items I.C.1. through I.C.6.**

"Termination" means the separation of a participant from the program who is no longer receiving Basic Readjustment Services or Retraining under EDWAA. Individuals may be considered participants for up to 90 days after last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services or Retraining, during which time they may continue to receive supportive services, as provided for in Section 314 (c)(15) and Section 4(24) of the Act.

For purposes of calculating average weeks participated, this single period of up to 90 days between "last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services or Retraining under EDWAA" and actual date of termination is defined as "inactive status" and is not to be included in "Average Weeks Participated". Terminees may continue to receive counseling necessary to assist in the retention of employment, for not more than 6 months following last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services (Section 314 (c)) or Retraining (Section 314 (d)).

Participants who have transferred from one title to another, or between programs of the same title, should be recorded as terminations from the title or program of initial participation and included as participants in the title or program into which they have transferred. If they are concurrent participants in more than one title or program, the type of termination determined for the final program should be recorded for all programs for these participants.

For purposes of calculating average weeks participated for such concurrent EDWAA program participants, the period between "last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services and Retraining funded under a given EDWAA program" (i.e., SSA, Governor's Reserve or Secretary's National Reserve) and actual date of termination from that EDWAA program is defined as "inactive status" and is not to be included in Line 24.

Item I.C.1. Entered Unsubsidized Employment from Retraining

Enter by column the total number of participants who, at termination, entered full- or part-time unsubsidized employment from Retraining through the end of the reporting period. (These participants may or may not have received Basic Readjustment Services.) This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C.

Item I.C.1.a. Relocated Out of Area

Enter the total number of participants who, at termination from other Retraining, entered unsubsidized employment after receiving relocation assistance and relocating outside the Substate Area which provided such relocation assistance, or within or outside of the State, if this assistance was provided by a Statewide SSA or by a program administered by the Governor. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C.1.

Item I.C.2. Entered Unsubsidized Employment From Basic Readjustment Services ONLY

Enter by column the total number of participants who, at termination, entered full- or part-time unsubsidized employment from Basic Readjustment Services ONLY through the end of the reporting period. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C.

Item I.C.3. Called Back/Remained With the Layoff Employer

Enter the number of terminees from the EDWAA program who, after being laid off by an employer, were recalled by that employer to a permanent job at the same or another location. Also include EDWAA program terminees who remained in a permanent job with an employer after receipt of a layoff notice from that employer. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C. NOTE: Do not include such terminees in the entry for Items I.C.1. or I.C.2., above.

Item I.C.4. Transferred to Other JTPA Programs

Enter the number of terminees who transferred to and entered programs funded under another JTPA title including Title III-Formula and Title III-National Reserve. Also include on this line terminees who transferred to and entered EDWAA programs operated by another Substate grantee, or who transferred to and entered EDWAA programs operated by the Governor (and conversely). This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C.

Item I.C.5. Entered Non-JTPA Training

Enter the number of terminees who entered, during the program year, training not funded with JTPA monies. This item is a sub-breakout of Item I.C.

Item I.C.6. All Other Terminations

Enter by column the total number of participants who were terminated for reasons other than those in Items I.C.1. through I.C.5., successful or otherwise, through the end of the reporting period.

SECTION II - TERMINEE PERFORMANCE MEASURES INFORMATION

Section II displays performance measures/parameters information. As indicated previously, data reported on characteristics of terminees should be based on information collected at time of eligibility determination unless otherwise indicated.

Governors may develop any participant record which meets the requirements of Section 629.35(c) and (d) of the JTPA regulations. The DOL/ETA Technical Assistance Guide: The JTPA Participant Record, dated May 1983, may be used as a reference.

Line Item Definitions and Instructions

Sex

Line 1 Male
Line 2 Female

Distribute the terminees according to Sex. The sum of Lines 1 and 2 should equal Item I.C.

Age

Line 3 29 and Under
Line 4 30-44
Line 5 45-54
Line 6 55 and Over

Distribute the terminees according to Age. The sum of Lines 3 through 6 should equal Item I.C.

Education Status

Line 7 Less Than High School
Line 8 High School Graduate or Equivalent (No Post-High School)
Line 9 Post-High School Attendee
Line 10 College Graduate and Above

Distribute the terminees according to Education Status. The sum of Lines 7 through 9 should equal Item I.C. NOTE: Line 10 is a sub-breakout for a specific group included in Line 9.

Family Status

Line 11 Single Head of Household with Dependent(s) Under Age 18.

Enter the total number of terminees for whom the above Family Status classification applies.

Race/Ethnic Group

Line 12 White (Not Hispanic)
Line 13 Black (Not Hispanic)
Line 14 Hispanic
Line 15 American Indian or Alaskan Native
Line 16 Asian or Pacific Islander

Distribute the terminees according to the Race/Ethnic Groups listed above. For purposes of this report, Hawaiian Natives are to be recorded as "Asian or Pacific Islander". The sum of Lines 12 through 16 should equal Item I.C.

Other Barriers to Employment

Line 17 Limited English Language Proficiency
Line 18 Handicapped
Line 19 Reading Skills Below 7th Grade Level

Enter the total number of terminees for whom each of the above Other Barriers to Employment apply.

Benefits Status

Line 20 U. C. (Unemployment Compensation) Claimant

Enter the total number of terminees for whom each of the above benefits status classifications apply.

Labor Force Status

Line 21 Unemployed: 15 or More Weeks of Prior 26 Weeks

Enter the total number of terminees for whom the above Labor Force Status classification applies.

Veteran Status

Line 22 Veteran (Total)
Line 23 Vietnam Era

Enter the total number of terminees for whom each of the above Veteran classifications apply, as defined in Section 4 (26)(A)(B) and (D) of the Act. Line 23 is a sub-breakout for a specific group included in Line 22.

Other Program Information

Line 24 Average Weeks Participated

Enter the average number of weeks of participation in the EDWAA program for all terminees. Weeks of participation include the period from the date an individual becomes a participant in EDWAA through the date of a participant's last receipt of Basic Readjustment and/or Retraining. **Exclude the single period of up to 90 days during which an individual may remain in an inactive status prior to termination. Time in inactive status for all terminees should not be counted toward the actual number of weeks participated.** Inactive status is defined as that period between "last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services and/or Retraining under EDWAA" and actual date of termination. (See Item I.C.)

To calculate this entry: Count the number of days participated for each terminee, including weekends, from the start date of his/her participation in EDWAA until his/her last receipt of Basic Readjustment Services and/or Retraining under EDWAA. Divide this result by 7. This will give the number of weeks participated for that terminee. Sum all the terminees' weeks of participation and divide the result by the number of terminees, as entered in Item I.C. **This entry should be reported to the nearest whole week.**

Line 25 Average Hourly Wage -- Pre-Program

Enter the average hourly pre-EDWAA wage of all terminees. In calculating this average, use the hourly wage from the job of dislocation. Those terminees who had no pre-EDWAA employment should be counted as "\$0.00" hourly wage.

To calculate this entry: Sum the pre-program hourly wage for all terminees shown in Item I.C. Divide the result by the number of terminees shown in Item I.C. **NOTE:** For the calculation, use the hourly wage regardless of whether the individual was employed full- or part-time.

Line 26 Average Hourly Wage at Termination

Enter the average hourly wage at termination for the total number of terminees in Items I.C.1. through I.C.3.

To calculate this entry: Sum the hourly wage at termination for all the terminees shown in Items I.C.1. through I.C.3. Divide the result by the number of terminees shown in Items I.C.1. through I.C.3.

Hourly wage includes any bonuses, tips, gratuities and commissions earned.

Line 27 Total Program Costs (Federal Funds)

Enter the total accrued expenditures, through the end of the reporting period, of the funds allocated to the SSA under Sections 302(c)(2) and 302(d) of the Act or otherwise distributed by the Governor to the SSAs under Section 302(c)(1)(E). On the separate WAPRs: (1) covering participants and terminees projects funded under Section 302(c)(1); (2) or participants and terminees in Secretary's National Reserve Grants projects funded under Section 302(a)(2) of the Act, enter the total expenditures for all participants and terminees served in such programs through the end of the reporting period. Include, as appropriate, accrued expenditures against JTPA Title III funds provided for PY88 and PY87 which were carried into EDWAA and used for EDWAA purposes, if any. Include expenditures of Federal funds only.

NOTE: Entries will be made to the nearest dollar. Negative entries are not acceptable. The WAPR program cost data will be compiled on an accrual basis. If the recipient's accounting records are not normally maintained on an accrual basis, the accrual information should be developed through an analysis of the records on hand or on the basis of best estimates.

The sum of the entries for Line 27, Total Program Costs, of the WAPR (i.e., total for the State's SSAs under EDWAA) should equal the entry for Column B., Line 10, Total Accrued Expenditures (Substate Grantees) of the WQFR for the same recipient that includes the final quarter of the same program year.

Line 27 of the Statewide WAPR for the Governor's Reserve activity (Section 302(c)(1)) should equal Column A., Line 10 of the WQFR for the same recipient that includes the final quarter of the same program year; and Line 27 on the WAPR for the Secretary's National Reserve Grants (Section 302(a)(2)) to the State should equal Column B., Line 5 on that WQFR.

Line 28 Needs-Related Payments

Enter the total accrued expenditures for needs-related payments to eligible dislocated workers who do not qualify or have ceased to qualify for Unemployment Compensation, in order to enable such workers to participate in training or education programs under EDWAA (Section 314(e)). This is a sub-breakout of Line 27.

Line 29 Total Available Federal Funds

Enter the total Federal funds available for the EDWAA program described on this report including (1) unexpended funds carried over from previous program years, (2) funds allocated or awarded for this program year, and (3) any reallocation that increased or decreased the amount of funds available for expenditure through the end of this reporting period. Entries will be made to the nearest dollar.

The sum of the entries for Line 29, Total Available Federal Funds, of the WAPR (i.e., total for the State's SSAs under EDWAA) should equal the entry for Column B., Line 9, Total Federal Funds Available (Substate Grantees) of the WQFR for the same recipient that includes the final quarter of the same program year.

Line 29 of the Statewide WAPR for the Governor's Reserve activity (Section 302(c)(1)) should equal Column A., Line 9 of the WQFR for the same recipient that includes the final quarter of the same program year; and Line 29 on the WAPR for the Secretary's National Reserve Grants (Section 302(a)(2)) to the State should equal Column B., Line 1 on that WQFR.

SECTION III - FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION

Section III displays information based on follow-up data which must be collected through participant contact to determine an individual's labor force status and earnings, if any, during the 13th full calendar week after termination and the number of weeks s/he was employed during the 13-week period. Follow-up data should be collected from participants whose 13th full calendar week after termination ends during the program year (the follow-up group). **Thus, follow-up will be conducted for individuals who terminate during the first three quarters of the program year and the last quarter of the previous program year.**

For PY89 follow-up may be conducted for individuals who terminate during the first three quarters of the program year and postprogram data collection need not begin until October 1, 1989.

In order to ensure consistency of data collection and to guarantee the quality of the follow-up information, follow-up procedures must satisfy certain criteria. (See the Follow-up Guidelines included in these WAPR instructions, Appendix A.) Other procedures used to collect the follow-up data are at the discretion of the Governors.

NOTE: Every precaution must be taken to prevent a "response bias" which could arise because it may be easier to contact participants who were employed at termination than those who were not and because those who entered employment at termination are more likely to be employed at follow-up. Special procedures have been developed by which SSAs and States can monitor response bias. **If your response rates for those who were and were not employed at termination differ by more than 5 percentage points, the follow-up entries for the WAPR must be calculated using the "Worksheet for Adjusting Follow-up Performance Measures" in the Follow-up Technical Assistance Guide.** If the response rates differ by 5 percentage points or less, the following instructions for completing Lines 30-34 may be used.

Line 30 Employment Rate at Follow-up

Enter the employment rate at follow-up.

Calculate the employment rate by dividing the total number of respondents who were employed (full-time or part-time) during the 13th full calendar week after termination by the total number of respondents (i.e., terminees who completed follow-up interviews). Then multiply the result by 100. **This entry should be reported to the nearest one decimal (00.0).**

Line 31 Average Hourly Wage at Follow-up

Enter the average hourly wage of those employed (full-time or part-time) at follow-up.

To calculate this entry: Sum the hourly wage (and, if appropriate, add tips, overtime, bonuses, etc.) of each respondent employed at follow-up. Divide the sum of hourly wage for all respondents employed during the 13th full calendar week after termination by the number of respondents employed at the time of follow-up. **Respondents not employed at follow-up are not included in this average.**

Include any wages, bonuses, tips, gratuities, commissions and overtime pay earned.

Line 32 Average Number of Weeks Worked in Follow-up Period

Enter the average number of weeks worked in follow-up period.

To calculate the average number of weeks worked (full-time or part-time), divide the sum of the number of weeks worked during the 13 full calendar weeks after termination for all respondents who worked, by the total number of all respondents, **whether or not they worked any time during this 13-week follow-up period. This entry should be reported to the nearest one decimal (00.0).**

Line 33 Sample Size

Enter by column the size of the actual sample selected to be contacted for follow-up.

NOTE: If oversampling was used, the sample size should include all those selected, not just the required minimum sample size. Those deceased or severely incapacitated to the point of being unable to respond at follow-up may be excluded from the sample size.

Line 34 Response Rate

Enter the overall response rate, i.e., the percentage of complete surveys obtained.

To calculate the overall response rate, divide the number of terminees with complete follow-up information by the total number of terminees included in the follow-up sample (Line 33) and multiply by 100. **This entry should be reported to the nearest whole percent.**

NOTE: Complete follow-up information consists of substantive answers to the required follow-up questions and may not include "don't know", "no answer" or "don't remember".

SECTION IV - RETRAINING/BASIC READJUSTMENT SERVICES

Section IV displays information relevant to program activities funded under EDWAA.

Line 35 Received Basic Readjustment Services ONLY

Enter the total number of terminees, regardless of type of termination, who received Basic Readjustment Services ONLY, as indicated in Section 314(c) of the Act. The sum of Lines 35 and 36 should equal Item I.C. **NOTE: Individuals who receive only outreach and/or intake and initial assessment services or Rapid Response assistance are not participants/terminees.**

Line 36 Received ANY Retraining Activity
Line 37 Less than 26 Weeks
Line 38 26 or More Weeks

Enter the total number of terminees, regardless of type of termination, who received ANY Retraining activity included in Section 314(d) of the Act. Lines 37 and 38 are sub-breakouts of Line 36 and should be used to distribute terminees who received ANY Retraining activity by actual length of stay in all Retraining activities, whether or not such Retraining was completed. These terminees may or may not have received Basic Readjustment Services. The sum of Lines 37 and 38 should equal Line 36.

Note: Terminees who have received retraining activity funded under a cooperative agreement with : (1) other JTPA monies (i.e. 3%, 8%, Title II etc.) or (2) other than JTPA funds may be counted in Lines 36-41, PROVIDED SUCH TRAINING WAS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIALLY DETERMINED TRAINING OBJECTIVE.

Line 39 Completed Classroom Training: Basic Education or Attained GED
Line 40 Completed On-the-Job Training
Line 41 Completed Other Occupational Skills Training

Enter the total number of terminees for which each of these Retraining completion/attainment classifications apply. A terminee should be included in all appropriate categories.

NOTE: Basic Education in Line 39 includes remedial reading, writing, mathematics and/or English for non-English speakers. Attainment of a GED or a high school diploma upon completion of any training also should be included. (A terminee may be counted only once in this line item, as appropriate.)

Appendix A

Follow-up Guidelines

To ensure consistent data collection and as accurate information as possible, procedures used to obtain follow-up information must satisfy the following criteria:

- ° Participant contact should be conducted by telephone or in person. Mail questionnaires may be used in those cases where an individual does not have a telephone or cannot be reached.
- ° Participant contact must occur as soon as possible after the 13th full calendar week after termination but no later than the 17th calendar week after termination.
- ° Data reported are to reflect the individual's labor force status and earnings during the 13th full calendar week after termination and the number of weeks s/he was employed throughout the 13-week period after termination.
- ° Interview questions developed by DOL (see following Exhibit) must be used to determine the follow-up information reported on the WAPR. Respondents must be told that responding is voluntary and that information provided by them will be kept confidential. Other questions may be included in the interview. Attitudinal questions may precede DOL questions, but questions related to employment and earnings must follow.
- ° Attempts must be made to contact all individuals unless terminee populations are large enough to use sampling.
- ° At least six attempts may need to be made to contact enough individuals in the follow-up group to obtain the required response rate.
- ° For each SSA and for Statewide and National Reserve reports (WAPR), minimum response rates of 70% are required for each of the following two groups of dislocated workers: those who entered employment at termination and those who did not enter employment at termination. The response rate is calculated as the number of terminees with complete follow-up information divided by the total number of terminees included in the group eligible for follow-up.

EXHIBIT

Minimum Postprogram Data Collection Questions

A. I want to ask you about the week starting on Sunday, _____, and ending on Saturday, _____, which was (last week/two/three/four weeks ago).

1. Did you do any work for pay during that week?

_____ Yes [Go to 2]

_____ No [Go to C]

2. How many hours did you work in that week?

_____ Hours

3. How much did you get paid per hour in that week?

_____ Dollars per hour

4. How much extra, if any, did you earn in that week from tips, overtime, bonuses, commissions, or any work you did on the side, before deductions?

_____ Dollars

B. Now I want to ask you about the entire 13 weeks from Sunday, _____, to Saturday, _____.

5. Including the week we just talked about, how many weeks did you work at all for pay during the 13-week period?

_____ Weeks [Go to end]

ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

C. If answered "NO" to Question 1:

Now I want to ask you about the entire 13 weeks from Sunday, _____, to Saturday, _____.

6. Did you do any work for pay during that 13-week period?

_____ Yes [Go to 7]

_____ No [Go to end]

7. How many weeks did you do any work at all for pay during that 13-week period?

Terminee Populations for Follow-up

Each program (SSA, Governor's Reserve, Secretary's National Reserve) in EDWAA is responsible for conducting a follow-up of all or a sample of participants who have terminated from that program.

The "universe" of terminees for the follow-up includes all participants who terminated from a program. Those participants who may have been concurrent participants in more than one JTPA title/EDWAA program will be in the universe for each.

When selecting a sample from the universe, each title/program will be treated separately, so that an individual who had been a concurrent participant might be selected in one sample but not another. This, however, does not preclude the possibility that the participant might be selected in more than one sample. In the event that a concurrent participant has been selected in more than one sample, the responses collected from a single interview may be shared among the different titles/programs to avoid the necessity of multiple interviews with the same individual.

When an individual who has terminated from one title/program and subsequently become a participant in another program (i.e., not a concurrent participant) is selected in the sample for both titles/programs, separate interviews must be conducted. Further, if an individual is selected in one sample and is a participant in another title/program at the time of the interview, regular follow-up information should be determined and recorded.

Sampling Procedures

Where sampling is used to obtain participant contact information, it is necessary to have a system which ensures consistent random selection of sample participants from all terminees in the group requiring follow-up.

- ° No participant in the follow-up group may be arbitrarily excluded from the sample.
- ° Procedures used to select the sample must conform to generally accepted statistical practice, e.g., a table of random numbers or other random selection techniques must be used.
- ° The sample selected for contact must meet minimum sample size requirements indicated in Table 1.

The use of sampling will depend on whether the terminee populations are large enough to provide estimates which meet minimum statistical standards. If the number of terminees for whom follow-up is required is less than 138, sampling cannot be used. In such cases attempts must be made to contact all the appropriate terminees.

Table 1

MINIMUM SAMPLE SIZES FOR FOLLOW-UP

<u>Number of Terminees in Follow-up Population</u>	<u>Minimum Sample Size</u>	<u>Sampling Percentages</u>
1 - 137	All	100
138 - 149	137	94
150 - 159	143	92
160 - 169	149	89
170 - 179	154	87
180 - 189	159	85
190 - 199	164	84
200 - 224	175	82
225 - 249	185	78
250 - 274	194	74
275 - 299	202	71
300 - 349	217	67
350 - 399	229	62
400 - 449	240	57
450 - 499	250	53
500 - 599	265	50
600 - 749	282	44
750 - 999	302	38
1,000 - 1,499	325	30
1,500 - 1,999	338	22
2,000 - 2,999	352	17
3,000 - 4,999	364	12
5,000 or more	383	7.3

Minimum Sample Sizes for Follow-up

To determine the minimum number of terminees to be included in the follow-up sample, refer to Table 1 in the following instructions. Find the row in the left-hand column that contains the planned number of dislocated worker terminees. The required minimum sample size is given in the middle column of that row. The last column gives sampling percentages that will assure that the minimum sample size is obtained.

Correcting for Differences in Response Rates

Different response rates for those terminees who entered employment at termination and those who did not are expected to bias the performance estimates because those who entered employment at termination are more likely to be employed at follow-up. It is assumed that those who were employed at termination are easier to locate than those who were unemployed because the interviewer has more contact sources (e.g., name of employer). The resulting response bias can artificially inflate performance results at follow-up.

To account for this problem, separate response rates should be calculated for those who were employed at termination and for those who were not.

If the response rates of those employed at termination and those not employed differ by more than 5 percentage points, then the "Worksheet for Adjusting Follow-up Performance Measures" in the Follow-up Technical Assistance Guide must be used to correct the follow-up measures.

Appendix B

Definitions of Terms Necessary for Completion of Reports

EMPLOYMENT/TRAINING SERVICES

ASSESSMENT -- services are designed to initially determine each participant's employability, aptitudes, abilities and interests, through interviews, testing and counseling to achieve the applicant's employment related goals.

FOLLOW-UP -- is the collection of information on a terminee's employment situation at a specified period after termination from the program.

INTAKE -- includes the screening of an applicant for eligibility and: (1) a determination of whether the program can benefit the individual; (2) an identification of the employment and training activities and services which would be appropriate for that individual; (3) a determination of the availability of an appropriate employment and training activity; (4) a decision on selection for participation and (5) the dissemination of information on the program.

OUTREACH -- activity involves the collection, publication and dissemination of information on program services directed toward economically disadvantaged and other individuals eligible to receive JTPA training and support services.

EDUCATION STATUS

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL -- An adult or youth: (1) who is not attending school full-time and has not received a high school diploma or a GED certificate; or (2) who has not received a high school diploma or GED certificate and is enrolled full-time in an elementary, secondary or postsecondary-level vocational, technical, or academic school or is between school terms and intends to return to school.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR EQUIVALENT (No Post-High School) -- An adult or youth who has received a high school diploma or GED Certificate, but who has not attended any postsecondary vocational, technical, or academic school.

POST HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDEE -- An adult or youth who has received a high school diploma or GED certificate and has attended (or is attending) any postsecondary-level vocational, technical, or academic school.

COLLEGE GRADUATE -- A terminee who has received a degree (usually a BA or BS) conferred by a four-year college, university or professional school or an advanced degree from one of these institutions.

FAMILY STATUS

SINGLE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD -- A single, abandoned, separated, divorced or widowed individual who has responsibility for one or more dependent children under age 18.

RACE/ETHNIC GROUP

WHITE (NOT HISPANIC) -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

BLACK (NOT HISPANIC) -- A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

HISPANIC -- A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin (including Spain), regardless of race. NOTE: Among persons from Central and South American countries, only those who are of Spanish origin, descent, or culture should be included in the Hispanic category. Persons from Brazil, Guiana, and Trinidad, for example, would be classified according to their race, and would not necessarily be included in the Hispanic category. Also, the Portugese should be excluded from the Hispanic category and should be classified according to their race.

AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER -- A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent (e.g., India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan), or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa. Hawaiian natives are to be recorded as Asian or Pacific Islanders.

OTHER BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY -- Inability of an applicant, whose native language is not English, to communicate in English, resulting in a job handicap.

HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUAL -- Any individual who has a physical or mental disability which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment. NOTE: This definition includes disabled veterans for reporting purposes.

READING SKILLS BELOW 7th GRADE LEVEL -- An adult or youth assessed as having English (except in Puerto Rico) reading skills below the 7th grade level on a generally accepted standardized test.

NOTE: The following other methods of determination may be used:

- ° A school record of reading level determined within the last 12 months.
- ° If an applicant is unable to read and therefore cannot complete a self-application for the JTPA/EDWAA program, s/he may be considered to have English reading skills below the 7th-grade level.
- ° Individuals with any of the following may be considered to have English reading skills above the 7th-grade level:
 - A GED certificate received within the last year.
 - A degree (usually a BA or BS) conferred by a 4-year college, university or professional school.

If there is any question regarding reading ability, a standardized test should be administered.

BENEFITS STATUS

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CLAIMANT -- Any individual who has filed a claim and has been determined monetarily eligible for benefit payments under one or more State or Federal unemployment compensation programs, and who has not exhausted benefit rights or whose benefit year has not ended.

LABOR FORCE STATUS

UNEMPLOYED: 15 OR MORE WEEKS OF PRIOR 26 WEEKS -- An individual who is unemployed at the time of eligibility determination and has been unemployed for any 15 or more of the 26 weeks immediately prior to such determination, has made specific efforts to find a job throughout the period of unemployment, and is not classified as "Not in Labor Force".

VETERAN STATUS

VETERAN -- An individual who served in the active military, naval, or air service (of the U.S.), and who was discharged or released therefore under conditions other than dishonorable.

NOTE: The term "active" means full-time duty in the Armed Forces, other than duty for training in the reserves or

National Guard. Any period of duty for training in the reserves or National Guard, including authorized travel, during which an individual was disabled from a disease or injury incurred or aggravated in the line of duty, is considered "active" duty.

VIETNAM-ERA VETERAN -- A veteran, any part of whose active military, naval, or air service occurred between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975.

PROGRAM COSTS

ACCRUED EXPENDITURES -- The allowable charges incurred during the program year to date requiring provision of funds for: (1) goods and other tangible property received; and (2) costs of services performed by employees, contractors, subrecipients, and other payees.

NOTE: These charges do not include "resources on order", i.e., amounts for contracts, purchase orders and other obligations for which goods and/or services have not been received.

RETRAINING ACTIVITY

BASIC EDUCATION -- Includes remedial reading, writing, mathematics and/or English for non-English speakers.

OCCUPATIONAL SKILLS TRAINING -- Includes vocational education which is designed to provide individuals with the technical skills and information required to perform a specific job or group of jobs. For reporting purposes excludes On-the-Job Training.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING -- Is training in the public or private sector given to an individual, who has been hired first by the employer, while s/he is engaged in productive work which provides knowledge or skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job.

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
Washington, D.C. 20210

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, \$300

A-130

THIRD CLASS MAIL
U.S. Postage Paid
Permit No. G-59